

1129  
Cp.2

29

2

# THE BOOK OF RED AND YELLOW

BEING A STORY  
OF BLOOD AND A  
YELLOW STREAK

*By*  
FRANCIS CLEMENT KELLEY ✓  
"



CHICAGO

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY  
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1915

F.327  
K29  
Copy 2

Copyright, 1915,  
by  
FRANCIS C. KELLEY  
Chicago

2601

Press of  
The Henry O. Shepard Co.  
632 Sherman Street  
Chicago

JAN 25 1915

© CLA 391466

W.W.

## The Book of Red and Yellow

**R**EADERS of this book who have been following European war news will understand the reference to colors in the title. A friend suggested that I could appropriately call it "The Red Book," because it is a tale of blood. Another urged that "The Yellow Book" might be a better title, since it shows the yellow streak in human nature. Both suggestions appealed to me; but the using of both titles together seems better still. This book tells a tale of blood and shows the yellow streak in some human beings. The trail of the coward is over the perpetrators of the outrages which here are told. No one but a coward could take advantage of weakness and murder innocence. "The Book of Red and Yellow" expresses exactly what I want to express.



A few months ago strange rumors of outrages committed by the Constitutionalists in Mexico began to appear in American papers. The first inclination of practically all who read the items was to doubt; and the second inclination to shrug the shoulders and say: "Well, it's war." Even in Mexico itself, when the news of the horrors at Durango was received, Mexicans themselves charitably said to one another: "These things are the work only of irresponsible leaders and in one place. They do not imply that the Revolutionists have any such program in mind. Those who have done these fearful things will, in due time, be punished." But we were all wrong.

When Saltillo fell, the outrages were repeated. At Zacatecas they not only were repeated, but new infamies were added. At other cities, Zacatecas was outdone. Then the horrors were visited on every city and state taken by the Constitutional forces.

Some refugees from Mexico at last began to cross the American line. The border towns of Texas rapidly filled up with them. At Vera Cruz there were so many that they became a serious problem to the American authorities. Not only were officers of the Federal army, officials of the Huerta government and other political exiles among the refugees, but also priests who had never taken up arms or interfered in political matters, sisters whose lives had been given up to teaching the works of charity, brothers who had spent themselves on the education of the Mexican youth, bishops and archbishops. Over five hundred of these religious refugees came into the American lines. Most of them were destitute. Practically all had been robbed of everything they possessed. They told

of hardships, of murders, of crimes worse than murder, and of sacrileges. It was the men who heard these stories, many of them officers of the United States army and navy, who, shocked and outraged in their finer feelings, spread the awful news, which now began to reach the ears of the American people in all its repulsiveness.

It seemed, however, as if a conspiracy of silence had been organized. Reputable papers, supposed to be anxious to print the truth and to give the news, did neither. Statesmen, so-called, pooh-poohed everything. The man on the street said the thing was too horrible for credence. The wily politician saw danger; but all the time the people in Vera Cruz, who had hearts, saw red.



At last a pitiful appeal to charity, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to give asylum to the homeless, reached The Catholic Church Extension Society, chiefly through the efforts of the Rev. R. H. Tierney, Editor of *America*, and the Rev. H. A. Constantineau, Provincial Treasurer of the Oblate Fathers in San Antonio. It was plain to the directors of the Society that, if they could not do justice to these suffering exiles, they could, at least, be charitable to them. The Most Reverend James E. Quigley, D.D., Archbishop of Chicago, at once directed me, as President of the Society, to go wherever the refugees were, and use what funds were needed to assist them. I proceeded at once to Texas, saw the situation, relieved the immediate needs in San Antonio, El Paso, Laredo, Galveston, etc., and then started for Vera Cruz. Before taking the boat for that point, I learned by cable that, when the news of the impending evacuation of that port by the American troops was given out, all the refugees who could go had left for Cuba. I went to Havana instead of Vera Cruz, and found as many of these refugees in Cuba as we had in the United States, but in a far more deplorable condition. With the funds at my disposal, I spent what was needed, and came back to report to the Board of Governors of the Society and beg that more assistance be extended.

While in Texas I had the opportunity of hearing the stories of the refugees and investigating them. Knowing that there would be more of these stories in Cuba, I requested the Archbishop of New Orleans, who spoke Spanish and who had been a bishop in Porto Rico, to come with me. He kindly agreed to do this; and His Grace took especial care of the investigations, securing information which perhaps could never have been secured otherwise.



On my return to Chicago, the Society took further action and authorized me to pay the expenses incident to saving and helping the remaining

priests and sisters at Vera Cruz, should the Government fail to act favorably on the request of the refugees for transportation to Galveston. Our appeal to the charity of American Catholics has not been in vain, yet much still remains to be done. I publish this book in the hope that it will stir up even a greater manifestation of charity. The Board of Governors of the Society, relying on this, has authorized the publication. Our motives are purely charitable and humanitarian. The Society declines to enter into the discussion of these things except from that standpoint. We have no political axe to grind. We do not propose to attach blame to any one, much less to the administration now in power in Washington. If mistakes have been made, good-will may rectify them in part. If the President and his advisors have been deceived, one can readily understand that it was an easy matter to deceive them. They were not on the ground. No one can read this story without knowing that it was to the interests of some party or parties to lend themselves to such deception. That the deception was a crime every reasonable man and woman will concede; and the crime is all the clearer in that the sufferers have, as usual, been the innocent. If there were no refugees except political ones, we could be sorry for them; but we would be obliged to admit that chances must be taken in Mexican politics. The political refugees, however, formed the minority. Those who had committed no crime, and who had not mixed in political squabbles of any kind, had to suffer the most.

It will easily be understood that I can not give the names of persons and places referred to in many of the statements to follow. After reading the statements, and considering the conditions in Mexico, the reader will not wonder why, in the majority of instances, such details had to be left out. I do not care to sign death-warrants. But I have the original documents in my possession, or I know where they are, and have consulted them. They may be examined by those who have a right to see them and whose honesty in asking for them is beyond question.

## I.

### THE GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE PERSECUTION.

To begin I give a partial list of the outrages which have been committed in the name of "liberty" and the Constitution, by the men who claim to be fighting in Mexico for both. Not one single charge is over-drawn. I give them as they were given to me, not by a few individuals, but practically by all. I append proofs which can not be questioned.

#### FIRST.

The Constitutionalists in Mexico have attempted to destroy, and practically have destroyed, three-fourths, if not more, of the Catholic Church in their country; which means that they have destroyed three-fourths of all the organized religious forces in Mexico. They did it deliberately, and as a result of a prearranged plan. They did it remorselessly and cruelly.

#### SECOND.

These same men drove out of Mexico, imprisoned or sent into hiding in fear of their lives, practically all the Catholic bishops in the Republic. Of those who remain, one alone is exercising his ministry unimpeded, because he is in the territory held by General Zapata, who is not and was not at any time subject to Carranza's authority. Of the others still on Mexican soil, three to my certain knowledge are in hiding, and one is in the penitentiary, sentenced to eight years' imprisonment for no crime whatever. To this charge may be added that of driving into exile priests and Sisters of Charity, religious men and women of all kinds, some of whom are Mexican citizens and some citizens of other nations.

#### THIRD.

These same men were guilty of seizing private property, even property held in the names of individuals, only because such property was used for religious purposes. They looted churches, destroyed libraries, scientific laboratories, colleges, schools, museums of Mexican archeology, valuable manuscripts and residences. They practically wiped off the map of Mexico her best institutions for higher education.

#### FOURTH.

They imprisoned, tortured and murdered priests and teachers.

#### FIFTH.

They committed most abominable and unspeakably vile outrages against the persons and virtue of young girls, good women, and Sisters whose lives had been vowed to the service of Almighty God.

## SIXTH.

They interdicted practices of religion publicly under the penalty of death.

## SEVENTH.

They usurped ecclesiastical jurisdiction by appointing to office, in what was left of the Church, such men as they pleased.

## EIGHTH.

In order to carry these things out with some show of reason, they published the vilest lies against the Church and her clergy.

## NINTH.

Proclaiming their desire for a free government under a constitution, they destroyed absolutely the liberty of the press, suppressing all newspapers and other publications not controlled and directed by themselves.

## TENTH.

In various other ways they set aside the very Constitution to which they proclaimed allegiance, and set it aside deliberately.



Before taking up the discussion of these charges, a word about the Revolution itself. Porfirio Diaz had given peace to Mexico, but had ruled the country as a dictator. The rebellion against him by Francisco Madero was successful, and Madero himself was legally elected President of the Republic. It is probable that Madero was the first President really elected by the people themselves. If there were irregularities in his election, these irregularities could not have changed the result. Under Madero, an attempt was made to give Mexico a constitutional form of government, or rather to put the Constitution into effect for the first time. It was not an ideal constitution. The addition to it of the Laws of Reform of Benito Juarez made it even less desirable. Neither of these were ideal democratic documents, but they were the law. The murder of Madero was a vile act, but it was never proven that Madero's successor, General Huerta, had been a party to that murder. Huerta himself was selected to succeed Madero in accordance with all the forms of law. He was a strong man, democratic, and fairly just. His government was a dictatorship like that of Diaz; but this much can be said of him: he could have brought peace to Mexico. He was prevented from doing this, however, by a new revolution headed by Governor Venustiano Carranza. The new revolution was fostered by influences from the United States. No revolution is possible in Mexico otherwise, since Mexico has no facilities for supplying arms and ammunition. All arms and ammuni-

tion for Carranza's outbreak were supplied by American firms, whose names are known, and who could easily have been prevented from supplying them. To end any revolution in Mexico, it is only necessary to forbid the sending of arms from the United States into that country. The Carranza forces had unlimited supplies, both of arms and money with which to buy them. They were successful, and were aided to their success by the closing of the port of Vera Cruz to Huerta. I do not question the right of our Government to close the port. Neither do I criticize the attitude of the administration to Huerta. I merely state the facts. On the face of things, it looked as if the people were fighting for constitutional government. I desire to show, in a general way in this chapter, how far the actions of the Constitutionalists agreed with their professions.



In the beginning, the outrages committed by Carranza's army were few, but at Durango it was clearly seen that the first step of the revolution was to be the utter destruction of religion. The Constitutionalists found at Durango a venerable and holy old man, who had long been the archbishop of that diocese. He was immediately arrested and from him was demanded a ransom of \$500,000. Now, the people of Mexico are not rich. The Church is not rich. There was no union between Church and State, and there had not been such a union for fifty years. The Constitutionalists might as well have asked the archbishop for \$500,000,000 as for \$500,000. He had not the money to give. He told his captors so. They flung him into prison. When they released him, it was only to keep him in durance within the city limits. They showered indignities upon his head. They arrested his clergy, exiled many, closed churches; in a word, they did all they could to stamp out religion in Durango. Some good people got together a few thousand dollars. Seeing that they could get no more, the Constitutionalists released the archbishop, but drove him out of the city. He went to Morelia, where again he was held for ransom, and again some good people bought his liberty. Then, after two months of this sort of thing, he escaped to the United States. I saw him, a sad old man, broken in health, but uncomplaining. Had I depended upon him for information, however, I would have had none. He suffered in silence, but I received the information from others, even those who were eye-witnesses of the affair.

Here is a statement by one of these eye-witnesses to the taking of the city of Durango by the Carranzista forces. I dare not give his name, for fear of the consequences to himself if he returns to Mexico:



No sooner were the Constitutionalists in the city, under the command of General Tomas Urbina, than there was a tremendous riot among them, and the second general in command was killed and a great number of others perished.

On hearing the first reports of the riot, crowds forced open the doors of all business houses, ransacking and setting fire afterward to them. Nine palaces and many houses were wiped out. Leading families who, previous to this horrible episode, had been considered rich, to-day have not even bread to eat, and many are without clothing.

The outrages committed did not cease at this point, but increased, and, on the second day, without court-martial, all the officials and chiefs taken during the battle or after were sentenced to death, thus disregarding entirely the guarantees and promises not to execute any one. Representatives of the leaders entered the archbishop's palace and other private homes, forcibly carrying with them those who had taken refuge there. Notwithstanding the entreaties of the sisters, mothers, wives and children, they were conducted as the vilest criminals to the dirtiest and unhealthiest prison cells. The day after they were compelled to beg from door to door the tremendous amount of money that had been demanded as ransoms. In the meantime other groups of armed men entered and profaned the Church of the Jesuit Fathers; and the Carmelites were horribly insulted and outraged. In the cathedral where the remains of the dead bishops and archbishops had been laid they scattered the remains with their swords. Not satisfied with this, they then approached the archbishop's palace, addressing the archbishop in very unbecoming language and demanded \$500,000 as a "loan," which amount he was unable to pay, and he was thereupon taken to jail, notwithstanding the fact that he was in an almost dying condition. Not even a chair or bed was given him, and he was left on the floor of the condemned cell.

These acts and others filled all the city with consternation, which increased by the hearing of other outrages which have been committed against families, and more especially so when priests were seen arrested for the mere fact of their profession and because they were unable to pay the money demanded of them.



What was done at Durango was the rule whenever the rebels conquered a new territory, and, when the payment of ransom was not sufficient, exile followed. Very early also in the conquests of the Constitutionalists came the same outrages in Matamoros. In both Durango and Matamoros the churches were pillaged, the desecrating of the graves of the dead bishops was done with the object of discovering if there might be some valuable objects buried with them. Swords were run through the disinterred bodies. That all this was premeditated and part of a plan, Carranza and the leaders themselves declared. In discourses published in their newspapers, they claimed that they intended to destroy militarism, capital and the clergy. It was in carrying out this plan that the cities were given to pillage, estates seized and religion trampled upon. It was a crime to have been a soldier in the Federal

army, to be a rich man, no matter how honestly the riches might have been gained, or to be a priest, teacher or Sister, no matter how much charity or good work had been done as such. There was no process of law. The Cathedral Chapters of Durango, Monterey, Zacatecas, Guadalajara, Puebla, etc., they dissolved by Constitutional authority.



The following statement, sworn to by the writers before a notary, gives an idea of the way the persecution was carried on in the north.

From its very beginning the Constitutional Revolutionary Party of Mexico showed itself to be anti-religious, as is proven by the injustices committed in the State of Sonora, Sinaloa and Chihuahua against priests and church property. But not in the degree that it afterward attained. Don Venustiano Carranza, who never before had shown signs of "clerophobia," allowed himself, according to our belief, to be influenced by certain members of what is known in Mexico as the "Reform Party," the same that tried to force Francisco I. Madero into a religious persecution. From then on, the irreligious spirit of the Constitutionalists' revolution appeared unmasked.

We shall say nothing of what preceded the taking of Monterey from lack of concrete data sufficiently authenticated.

MONTEREY.—They took Monterey, the capital of the State of Nuevo Leon, on April 24, 1914. According to the general custom, the Revolutionary officials left the churches undisturbed, but on the 27th of the same month they ordered all churches closed, and took possession of the keys. On May 12 the priests were cited to appear. Accordingly the Vicar-General, sixteen foreign and several Mexican priests went to the place appointed, where a "loan" of \$500,000 was demanded of them. As they declared themselves unable to give such an immense sum, they were put in prison. By the intervention of their respective consuls, the foreigners were set free, but at the same time declared banished from Mexican soil. The Vicar-General and the other Mexican priests remained in jail.

The archbishop's palace was occupied by the rebels, who destroyed a magnificent library and possessed themselves of the archives of the archdiocese. The printing-press of the archbishopric was taken over for the publication of the impious newspaper, *El Bonete*, in the pages of which were published, in an attempt to dishonor the priesthood, the documents found in the secret archives. (Records of diocesan disciplinary cases.—Ed.)

On June 7 they publicly burned the confessionals and other church furniture. They also publicly profaned the statues of the saints in the streets, casting lots on them and shooting at those which by lot were determined as "Huertistas." There were, moreover, numerous spoilations, robberies and other excesses committed in the churches.

As a climax to these infamous proceedings, the Governor of the State issued a decree, under date of July 14, in which, after an introduction very offensive to the clergy, which he designated as "corrupt and corrupting," religious liberty was practically abolished.

In several towns of this State were committed acts of sacrilegious savagery. In Tanquecillos, for example, they profaned the sacred vestments, using them for a dance. At Margaritas, the Ciborium of the Tabernacle was used in drinking "mescal." At Cerralbo they took the statues of the saints, not excepting that of the national devotion, Our Lady of Guadalupe, and cast them into a well, mutilating that of Our Lady of Lourdes to make it small enough to be forced in, at the same time issuing a decree in which it was declared that anyone caught trying to rescue the statues would be summarily executed. In Las Aldamas the churches were converted into barracks. A certain Father Regalado was obliged to walk a distance of about eighty miles, from Linares to Victoria. Another priest, Father Martin, parish priest of Galeana, was robbed of all he had, and it was only by fleeing to the mountains that he freed himself from still worse treatment.

TEPIC.—The city of Tepic, capital of the territory by that name, was captured in the middle of May. They imprisoned the bishop, Rt. Rev. Andres Segura, and Very Rev. Ramon Vilalto, Superior of the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, in the penitentiary about the 17th of the same month, sentencing them to eight years' imprisonment. Other priests were left at liberty, although forbidden to leave the city. That, at least, was the belief at first, but now we know that all the Missionary Fathers of the Heart of Mary residing there are actually in prison.

SALTIMBO.—This city, capital of Coahuila, fell into the hands of the Revolutionists in the beginning of June, if we are not mistaken. It is impossible to describe what the priests suffered there. Eight of them (four Jesuits, three Eudists and a Benedictine) were shut up in a dark room, and kept there eight days. Then, at midnight the door was opened, and they were told they were condemned to death. One by one they were taken out, and with each of them a mock execution was carried out in the minutest details—the line of sharpshooters, the signal to fire, the discharge and even the falling of the body, which was produced by a push from behind. Afterward they were taken in a stock car to Torreon, where they were shamefully paraded through the streets; and from there they were taken through Ciudad Juarez to the border. We have been told that other priests were forced to suffer the torment of the gallows, being tied by the neck and lifted into the air. One of them was raised thus three times, until he lost consciousness.

ZACATECAS.—This is the capital of the state of the same name, and was taken June 3 at sundown. Immediately after they captured Rev. Inocencio Lopez Velarde, who was a Fiscal Promoter, Professor of the Seminary and Chaplain of the Theresian Sisters, and after robbing him, took him to the outskirts of the city and killed him, afterward maltreating his dead body, which was found the next day, the head and chest riddled with bullets. On the 4th, early in the morning, they went to the College of the Christian Brothers, and took away its chaplain, Father Pascual Vega, and Brothers Adrian and Adolph, president and vice-president, respectively. All three were conducted to Bufo Hill and shot. No one in the city knew where they were till on the third day their bodies were found half-buried. The other brothers were sent to prison and subjected to

a thousand indignities. On the 25th all the priests of the cities were cited to appear. Twenty-three priests, headed by the Vicar-General, presented themselves. They were menaced with death if they would not give on the same day before 6 P.M. a "loan" of \$1,000,000, and were incarcerated in a miserable dungeon. There they were kept three days without food or drink and in danger of asphyxiation. In the afternoon of that day the "loan" was demanded, they took out the Vicar-General and another priest, pretending that they were to be shot, and at the same time threatening the others with a like punishment if they would not quickly give the sum demanded. Knowing very well that it was impossible for them to collect such a fabulous amount, especially if they kept them locked up, the Revolutionists allowed three of them to go out, and they were able to get together \$14,000. The rebels took this sum, but ordered them to continue their begging among the faithful until they collected at least \$100,000. They did so, but they were told that \$4,000 was missing, and obliged them to go out again and collect that sum, but they were not even then set at liberty. They were kept in jail until the night of July 3, when they were taken to the depot and put in a dirty box-car and sent to Torreon and Ciudad Juarez, guarded by a convoy of drunken soldiers, who were constantly menacing them with their guns. There they were despoiled of all they had and were obliged to take refuge in the United States. The Episcopal palace was changed into a barracks.

A brutal deed was perpetrated at Villa de Guadalupe. Father Valeriano Medina, a charitable priest, was taking care of the wounded in the parish school, which he had converted into a hospital. The Revolutionists entered the house on horseback, killing some of the patients with their horse's hoofs, and taking the others out to be shot. The Father, who was the especial object of these outlaws' search, escaped. The parish priest of Cabra, Rev. Jesus Alba, was taken to the cemetery and killed.

AGUASCALIENTES.— The capital of the state of that name, was taken shortly after Zacatecas, and all the priests exiled. On the 4th of August, the confessionals and some statues of saints were publicly burned. Governor Fuentes threatened with death any priest who would attempt to exercise his ministry.

SAN LUIS POTOSI.— July 17 they peacefully entered San Luis Potosi, capital of the state of that name. Nevertheless, this was one of the cities in which the clergy had to suffer most. On the 19th, they asked the Vicar-General for the bishop's carriage, and Col. Alberto de Avila struck him and put him in prison. Thanks to the German consul, he was liberated in two hours.

On the 20th an order was published forbidding the celebration of Mass on week days under penalty of \$1,000 fine for the first offense, \$2,000 for the second, \$3,000 for the third, and either exile or death for the fourth. Confession, outside the danger of death, was prohibited, and even then only with a government official present to hear. Ringing of the bells was to be confined to secular uses.

On July 25 a proclamation of exile for all priests was published, ordering them to be at the depot at five o'clock next morning. They complied, but had to wait until six in the evening, when the Carranzistas appeared. They allowed ten priests to remain for services in the city,

and one other because he was sick. The other twenty-seven were put into a stock car and thus taken to Charcas. Here they were taken out, made to look into some wells, and threatened with being thrown into them. Then they took them to a hacienda and enclosed them in a sacristy, the walls of which were bespattered with human blood. After three days they relieved them of all they had. They detained the bishop's secretary, the first assistant of Del Sagrario parish, and a Franciscan monk. The others were freed on condition that they leave the country. They arrived at Monterey, via Saltillo, on July 31. Here the Vicar-General, Very Rev. Agustin Jimenez was detained. The others were again arrested, and taken under a guard to Nuevo Laredo, with orders to shoot anyone trying to escape. Then their photographs were taken, as if they were criminals, and they were obliged to cross the border. Among the exiles was Rev. Fr. Espinosa, a venerable Franciscan, ninety-four years of age.

The magnificent Episcopal palace was sacked, and the books of its library sold at ridiculous prices. We hear, however, that an Englishman claimed the palace and everything contained therein as his own, and that it was turned over to him.

QUERETARO.—This city, capital of the state of that name, was taken by the Carranzistas on the 29th of July. The same day Fathers Gabriel Goray, a Carmelite, and Sousa, a Franciscan, were kept in the De la Cruz barracks two days, and then driven through the streets on horseback, vested in their religious habits. Then they liberated the latter and made the former enter the army. The churches were all closed, the Revolutionists keeping all the keys, except those of the churches San Jose and Santa Clara, which were deposited in the Spanish vice-consulate. In this vice-consulate several Spanish priests took refuge, and others hid themselves in various disguises. On the 30th or 31st the Catholic high school was attacked, and the Christian Brothers and the French vice-consul taken out by armed force. On the 3d of August the Seminary was changed into a Constitutionalist police station. On the 8th the confessionals were burned in Zena Garden. Father Rabago was imprisoned and Canon Florencio Rosas put in charge of the diocese of Queretaro. On the 11th they attacked the vice-consulate, taking prisoners the priests hidden there. These were taken at bayonet point to the barracks De la Alameda, thence to Griega, afterward back to the same barracks, and finally set free. On the 27th a large Catholic manifestation caused great fear among the Revolutionists. They exiled all the Spanish priests on the 29th, taking them to San Luis Potosi, where they were detained until September 12 and then sent to Laredo. The others were obliged to appear in the former bank of San Luis in order to declare what goods they possessed, how they acquired them and what were the possessions of the diocese.

GAUNAJUATO.—On the 31st of July almost all the cities of this very rich state were captured. In the capital, on the 1st of August, "loans" were forced, heavier ones on priests than others. After a few days all the priests were convoked and told that confession was absolutely prohibited, even to the dying, and that any commission of ladies asking for repeal of these laws would not be received.

LEON.—Although they entered this town July 31, they were expelled the next day by Pascual Orozco; but regained it on August 2. They imposed on the bishop a "loan" of \$500,000, and, as his representatives could not collect more than \$6,000 they took possession of the stipends and goods of the clergy. The canons were arrested and imprisoned in their own houses. Foreign priests were expelled. They prohibited the ringing of church bells and drove out the nuns from the convents.

IRAPUATO.—Here the confessional were burned August 3; confession was prohibited under pain of death, and nuns exiled. They tried to kill the parish priest and Father Chavez.

SILAO.—They arrested all the priests, and, on giving them their freedom, they kept as hostages the parish priest and another Father whom they robbed, even of the dinner and supper their families brought them.

CELAYA.—The Missionary Sons of the Heart of Mary hid themselves in near-by farms. The Archbishop of Michoacan, Most Rev. Leopoldo Ruiz, who happened to be there, hid himself in the home of a Catholic gentleman. The other priests hid in different houses in the city. One of the fugitives betrayed the others, telling where they were concealed, and all were captured. The Archbishop, Father Penaflor, a Franciscan, and Father Lara, a parish priest, were especially sought after. Thanks to the courage of Mr. C——, who was on the point of being shot three or four times for not telling where His Grace was concealed, he was able to save himself by flight to a hacienda. Some others were also able to remain in hiding. Those who were imprisoned, in number about twenty-five, as they were unable to pay the \$60,000 demanded, were exiled; being taken to Laredo in a filthy stock car.

ZAMORA.—It seems that in this town the venerable Archbishop of Durango was imprisoned, and with all his priests compelled to sweep the streets. He was taken, guarded and on foot, to Piedad, and from there by train to Irapuato, August 27, according to the account of an eye-witness.

TOLUCA.—The Revolutionists entered this city, the capital of the State of Mexico, on August 8. On the 10th they closed all the churches, keeping the keys themselves, and they have not been opened until the present day. They laughed at a commission of Catholics who asked permission to have Mass, saying they would allow it if for each mass they paid them \$300,000. The Sacraments and all public worship were prohibited. They arrested Fathers Garduño, Campos, Orhalas and Joaquin. The Passionist Fathers, nine in number, whose hiding-places were discovered, were taken prisoners and incarcerated for fifteen days; then permitted to go to the Spanish vice-consulate on the express condition that they would leave the Republic within fifteen days. Because he would not disclose the hiding-place of the Holy Cross Fathers, Brother Mariano Gonzales, of the Missionary Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, was shot.

The Church of Carmen was plundered, a very large and beautiful statue of the Sacred Heart chopped to pieces, and the sacred vessels, jewels and ornaments of the statues stolen. They also sacked the Church of La Merced and were engaged in burning various things taken therefrom until eleven at night.

In nearly the whole city of Toluca there was no priest to baptize, for all were in hiding.

Finally Father Paredes tried to make some arrangement, but was able to obtain absolutely nothing. Before this a decree was published, which reached even the absurdity of prohibiting fasting and mortification, etc.

MEXICO.—In the capital of the Government religion has relatively suffered less. However, Father Paredes was set up as Vicar-General. About thirty priests have been arrested, and some of them beaten. For example, Father Zaragoza. The House of Retreat of the Angels was changed to a barracks, and the confessionals of its Oratory burned in the streets. The Church of St. Bridget was closed and the Carranzistas took possession of the rectory, etc.

PUEBLA.—In this, the capital of the state, Father Escobedo was placed as administrator of the diocese. They dissolved the Cathedral Chapter and exiled its members; the confessionals of many of the churches were taken away and stored in a cellar. The places in the cathedral formerly occupied by the confessionals were marked with secret society emblems. The pulpit of the cathedral was declared open to all. A decree was published suppressing confession. A dance was held in the chapel of the Catholic College of the Jesuits. By another decree all religious were expelled. They took possession of De la Salle College and others. They made a barracks of the Episcopal palace, etc.

VERA CRUZ.—The capital of this state being protected by American troops, all has been peaceful there, but in some cities of the state atrocities have been perpetrated.

At Tepozotlan they stole the ciborium, dropping the Sacred Hosts on the floor, and not permitting them to be gathered up until two days later.

At Jalapa all priests were expelled, being given twenty-four hours to leave.

In Cordoba all the churches were taken possession of and a decree of expulsion against all priests was published.

Orizaba fell into the hands of the Carranzistas August 24. Four days after all nuns were expelled. Afterward, by proclamation, all priests were banished and the churches closed; all except that of El Calvario, for fear of the people. Mass, however, was not allowed to be said there.

The above statements give a very general idea of the persecutions. In the chapters to follow a few statements more in detail are given.

## II.

### GUADALAJARA.

This statement I print in full. To attempt to compress it would be to destroy its force. It was written by an exile who suffered the horrors of the persecution himself. Were I to take the facts as a basis for writing the story myself I would, at the same time, take a note of personal experience out of it, which could only destroy some of the vividness of the sad narration.

"After a weak show of resistance and a sham battle on the outskirts of the city, Huerta's troops abandoned the city of Guadalajara in the night between the 7th and 8th of July, 1914. During the sortie the inefficient General Mier was killed and his small army scattered. At the same time the army of General Obregon entered the city by detachments. They met no resistance from the inhabitants, but were acclaimed by a number of ragged workingmen and some revolutionists of the city. Up to this time it was thought that the Huerta newspapers were libeling his opponents and that the Obregonistas were not as barbarous as the Villistas and their kind. The invaders themselves declared that the city of Guadalajara would be convinced that the Constitutionalist cause was that of peace and justice; and they ordered the motto of Juarez to be engraved over the door of every school: 'Respect for the rights of others is peace.' The irony of this motto is great. Scarcely had the Constitutionalists entered the city when they confiscated all the automobiles. They began with that of the archbishop, which Obregon appropriated for himself. They took all the carriages and fine horses. The officers broke into the houses of the well-to-do, whether they were at home or away. They camped there and parceled out among themselves and their women and friends the furniture, table service, and even the clothes of the women and children of the house. They searched everywhere for the officials of the Huerta government, for the principal employees of that government, for the members of the Catholic party and for every one whom they considered political enemies. A number of these were shot, some with the greatest cruelty.



"General Obregon managed to restrain individual outrages of his soldiers, but the pillage went on unchecked in other forms as violent and as criminal. The barracks were left empty, while the troops were purposely lodged in the most flourishing and best-kept institutions of learning and charity. On July 9 a picket of soldiers was placed at all the doors of

the Jesuit College. This is the best in the city, and possesses a fine equipment of physical and chemical apparatus from Europe. The rector had just left the classrooms on the first floor, when a band of Yaqui Indians, bedecked with feathers, entered and camped with their women in the clean and elegant lecture-rooms. Colonel Calderon, one-time schoolmaster and afterward an inmate of San Juan de Ulua prison, and now a shining light in the Constitutional army, although without any education and evidently without principle, took for himself the rector's room and quartered his officers and musicians in the upper stories. He refused to listen to protests. He made no effort to stop the destruction of scientific instruments which was going on, nor did he respect the French flag which hung above the door of the building. Only one who has seen it can picture a barracks in Mexico. It is a mass of human bodies, filthy men, women and children, who cook their meals, make their beds, wash their clothes and bathe themselves in view of all. They live with all their instruments, arms, playthings and animals heaped around them.

"As the spoliation was to be accomplished by degrees, the rector was allowed a miserable lodging in the barracks, which he had to accept, unless he wished to sleep in the street. For several days he was not allowed to pass out the door of his own house. Colonel Calderon's troops are the most moral, if there can be any morality among soldiers where the petty thefts of the enlisted men are punished by death, while wholesale thefts are committed with impunity by the officers. Calderon's troops are composed of full-blood Yaquis, who possess a religion of a kind, in that they carry pictures and medals of saints on their hats and show respect toward churches and priests. On this account the Constitutionalists dissemble the war which they are making on religion by leading the Indians to think that they are pursuing, not their beloved priests, but one Mr. Clergyman (Don Clero), whom they portray as the worst of criminals. The Yaquis showed respect to the Jesuit priests who continued to live among them. The Indians did not destroy the furniture and apparatus except after the example of some of the officers who came there.

"The other colleges suffered even a worse fate. The ecclesiastical seminary, which is one of the finest buildings in the city, was occupied by troops and horses the same day that the Jesuit College was entered. At once officers and soldiers began to sack it. They threw the books out of the windows or sold them for 10 cents a volume to any one who would buy. Still worse was the occupation of the College of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart. This is an English establishment. But the consul protested in vain, and the flag of that country was not respected. The most shameless troops, with their women and horses, took possession of the

beautiful garden of the nuns. The women camp-followers afterward entered the sleeping apartments of the Sisters and stole the clothes of the nuns and their pupils. They dressed themselves up in these, or sold the finest clothes and furniture for a pittance and destroyed what they could not use or sell. The sick and wounded were placed in the infirmary of the college, notwithstanding that there was no need of it, because there was plenty of room in the hospitals. The soldiers and their shameless women went to bed in the rooms of the Sisters and pupils. The teachers and children had fled the evening before at the approach of the bandits.



"It can not be said that these outrages were committed only by the soldiers, and without the knowledge or consent of the so-called Generals Obregon, Lucio Blanco, Rafael Buelma, Benjamin Hill, and the pretended Governor, M. M. Dieguez. The last-named was once a miner at Cananea and a resident for several years in San Juan de Ulua prison on account of a mine theft committed by him at Cananea. These were the men who, for the purpose of uplifting society, advancing civilization and spreading the sciences, preferred to leave the many barracks and other available public buildings unoccupied and to lodge their troops in these centers of learning. These were the men who commanded the flags of foreign nations to be taken down from the houses and who threatened the consuls who dared defend their countrymen or who would attempt to appeal at any time to Mexico City or Washington. These Constitutional leaders were informed and led by the secret society members of the place, who are more intelligent but not less savage than themselves, and who advised them to levy their heaviest tolls on Catholics and to imprison, as they did, the priests and other persons whom they pointed out as enemies deserving to be shot. These Constitutional leaders are the very men who closed all the courts, so that nobody could defend his rights. They destroyed all means of communication, so that they would not have to obey any one, even Carranza himself. Finally they got a woman of the underworld, a notorious character called Atala Apodaca, to proclaim war unto death upon the Catholic priests. And they published the vilest attacks and the grossest calumnies in two or three miserable sheets, which were the only papers they allowed to be circulated.

"At first they did not persecute the priests so violently. But before long the mask dropped from their faces. They faked a plot of the clergy which had for its object to make the people rise against the new government. On July 21 Governor Dieguez gave an order forcibly to arrest all the priests of the city and to take possession of all the churches. Soldiers were let loose in detachments of fifty. They went through the whole city and arrested not only the priests, but also the sextons and even persons

found praying in the churches. They took the Marist Brothers, with many boys who were at play in the college. They arrested a number of servants, and even some seamstresses, whom they accused of having made mustaches and beards to disguise the priests. The poor prisoners were forced to pass the night in the barracks, cooped up in foul-smelling cells, where they had to stand or to sit among drunken soldiers, who pointed their guns at them and brutally threatened and vilely insulted them. The prisoners were stripped of everything — money, watches, books, and even glasses. Among them were sick people who were brought in on cots. These were simply the orders of Governor Dieguez, which were carried out by his bloodthirsty troops. They were eager to shoot, without investigation, any one whom a drunken or furious officer might point out.

“The following day they filled the Escobedo prison with more than one hundred and twenty priests of all nationalities. Among them was the Bishop of Tehuantepec, Rt. Rev. Ignacio Plasencia, who was visiting in the city. The accusers did not even know the names of the prisoners. Three improvised courts made ridiculous the forms of justice. They afterwards declared that ‘no cause was found for proceeding against the defendants’ (*no haber habido causa para proceder en contra*). Meanwhile the prisoners were kept isolated (*incommunicado*) in the dungeons for six or seven days, against all the laws of the country. To inquiries by friends as to what offense they had committed or what charge there was against them, the only answer was ‘these are the orders of General Dieguez.’



“The Catholics of the city were in consternation. There would have been an uprising, except for the fear that the innocent prisoners would be shot. There was no service on Sunday, nor were the bells rung. The churches were not opened during these days, except to save the Sacred Hosts such as had not been profaned. These had been picked up and removed (*recogidas*) by pious women. Meantime the Constitutionalists took advantage of these days to invade the churches. They profaned them with their troops and women. They stole everything of value in some of them. And they searched for arms and cannon which they said were hidden there. They even opened and profaned the graves and announced that they had found bodies of persons assassinated by the clerical party, together with the arms which they had hidden there. All that they really did find was thirty or more old guns which had been bought for 25 cents each by the Marist Brothers for the military drills of their students. The Constitutionalists celebrated this find as a victory, and made vague assertions about having found even a cannon and dynamite bombs in nobody-knows-what hiding-place of the priests. They

kept up these charges until they made themselves ridiculous. Then they abandoned them for others equally false and such as could be invented only by wild men. A week later, when Obregon returned from Colima, they began to set the priests free without any more order or judgment than was shown before. They were allowed to depart, minus the money which had been stolen from them in part or altogether in the various places where they had been.

"The Jesuits did not return to their college, because they were forbidden to. Moreover, the officers and soldiers had cleaned out everything of use to themselves. They had even gone so far as to sell to any one who wished to buy costly scientific apparatus for which they took a dollar or two. Colonel Calderon, who was careful under other circumstances, now showed that his sectarianism was equal to his lack of culture. He had promised to protect the library and scientific laboratories. For fifteen days he had lived with the Jesuits. During that time he was convinced that they were honorable gentlemen. But to no avail. Calderon let them be thrown into prison as common criminals. Not only did he not protest himself, but he paid no attention to the protest of some of his officers and almost all of the soldiers. The college was occupied thenceforth by a guard of soldiers, and the musicians and their families. No protection was afforded the college, either by the captain who was sick there, or by Dieguez, to whom notice was given, or by Secretary Berlanga, who, with cynicism, had come some days before to see for himself the fine equipment and perfect arrangement of the physical and chemical and natural-history laboratories and the library. Finally, August 3, the college building was confiscated, with all that it contained, without allowing the priests to take even their personal effects or clothes.



"Many of the professors in the colleges of the Jesuit Fathers, the Ladies of the Sacred Heart and the Marist Brothers were Mexicans. But most of them were foreigners who had come to Mexico to supply the lack of Mexicans in these congregations. And, so as to destroy them with less trouble, the Constitutionalists made up their minds to banish the foreign priests and professors from Guadalajara. In order to suppress the college of the nuns, all they had to do was to take away the building and steal or destroy everything in it.

"August 5, Mr. Lobato, mayor of the city (*presidente del ayuntamiento*), who is a man of some education, but with rabid anti-Catholic notions, directed the foreign consuls to call their nationals among the priests and professors to the city hall (*palacio de ayuntamiento*) in order to define to them their situation. About forty-eight gathered there. He marched them through the streets to the government palace (*palacio del*

*gobierno*) to hear the orders of Dieguez. The Governor did not show himself. He is an uncouth person, who does not know how to talk. Instead, his secretary, M. Aguirre Berlanga, appeared. He is as small in mind as he is in body. If he knows how to write, certainly he can not speak or appear to advantage before people. He spoke in the name of Dieguez. He said that, although most were innocent, nevertheless for political reasons the Governor would banish them in three days from Mexican soil. They all protested against such a flagrant violation of the Constitution and the international laws committed by these very persons who called themselves Constitutionalists. The application of the thirty-third article of the Constitution — namely, the expulsion of "pernicious" foreigners without formal trial, is reserved to the President of the Republic alone. They appealed to Carranza and to all the foreign consuls. But no attention was paid to anybody, nor were telegrams allowed to be sent. The foreigners were compelled to leave by the port of Manzanillo, although that port was still occupied by Federals. To their protests, Dieguez replied that the Constitutionalists would be in possession of the port in three days and that the exiles meantime could wait any place they pleased, even in the field of battle, until the way should be cleared. As the foreigners were Europeans, they asked Dieguez to delay the banishment until the road to Vera Cruz should be opened, because Carranza was on the point of entering Mexico and it would be less expensive for all of them to leave the country by this road. Dieguez replied that they must leave by way of Manzanillo, in spite of its unhealthy climate. From there they might go any place they chose. He would do no more than put them on a ship. He would not give them any assistance for the journey. All that he would grant was five days, without any extension of time. Since Dieguez is as stupid as he is fanatical, the decent people of Guadalajara could not impress upon him the barbarity of this banishment by way of Manzanillo nor the need of assistance felt by these men who had been robbed of everything they possessed, nor the violation of all law and justice which he was committing against all foreign nations by forbidding them communication with their consuls in Mexico or the United States.

"On August 10 the foreign priests and professors were given an hour's notice to be at the railroad station. The purpose of the short notice was to prevent the people of the city from gathering to bid them farewell. They were threatened with prison or death if they delayed. Soldiers were waiting for them in the station. There also were a number of Constitutionalists, secret service members, and a band of music. Like a tiger lapping the blood of its victim and roaring with delight over the dismembered body, Dieguez ordered the band to play the hymn of

Juarez and, after other such pieces, as the train pulled out, 'la Golandrina.' The Catholics and pupils of the exiles who crowded the station, having come to bid them an affectionate farewell, wept with grief and indignation. The priests also wept to see so many good people in Mexico victims of a few bandits. They were somewhat consoled with the hope that their own woes would cease when they should arrive among people who could better appreciate their science and virtue. But their cares were not to cease there. The guard which accompanied them had orders to leave them at the end of the road, even though it were in the line of fire between Federals and Constitutionalists. When they arrived at Colima, Governor Ruiz, who was more humane than Dieguez, knowing that the road was not open and that there was no food on the way, and that to abandon the exiles there would be to condemn them to death, gave orders to keep them all night in the station in the car in which they arrived. The following day he took their names, because in Guadalajara even this much had not been done. Governor Ruiz informed them that they would continue to be prisoners, but he gave them permission to live in the city, with the city limits as their prison walls. He allowed them to lodge wherever they could, and made them pay their own expenses, besides requiring them to report daily at the police headquarters.



"When the Constitutionalists entered Manzanillo, whch was not until some days afterward, the big chief Dieguez wanted to send the forty-seven foreigners away at once, without giving a thought as to whether there was a train, a ship or lodging and food in Manzanillo. August 20 he gave orders for all to be in the station. It was known there that there was no train; but the passengers were kept in ignorance until midday. The governor knew all day there was no train. But he was feasting in a neighboring plantation. He said to his military aide, Lepe, that he would punish them with one day of Constitutional camp life. For fifteen hours they waited for the train and almost suffocated with the heat. At night the Governor arrived and ordered the train to start. But the English consul, and the German consul who himself was being expelled, and the Spanish consul, all pointed out that in Manzanillo there was neither food nor ship, and they prevailed on Dieguez to let them wait in Colima until some steamship should arrive.

"Eight days more the exiles waited for a ship. They lived on the charity of the good citizens of Colima and especially on the alms of the priests of this diocese who, unconscious of themselves, displayed wonderful charity. On the twenty-ninth of August came a new order to depart, because a ship was soon expected. Since now Carranza had

established his government in Mexico and since he had promised the United States to respect the persons and property of foreigners, the governor was asked that they be allowed to receive orders from Carranza or from the foreign ministers in the capital, to the effect that they might sail from Vera Cruz, or at least that their passage be paid from Manzanillo. But Governor Ruiz would neither do nor allow anything of the kind. He who was living in a house he had stolen, and he who ate and slept in another's home, need have little care for unhappy exiles. He said that there was a ship at Manzanillo and meantime they would be lodged in the hotel recently confiscated from D. Blas Ruiz. But this lodging, during the three days they had to stay in Manzanillo, consisted only of the choice of the floor for a bed or some rooms which had been wrecked in a filthy, abandoned hotel. On the floor below were lodged the troops and on that above the officers and some shameless women. The port, which had lately been abandoned by several thousand Federals, had been cleaned out of all provisions. As a climax to the outrages suffered by the priests, they were denied permission in that hot climate even to bathe in the sea. To add to their woes and to share them, fifty nuns, Ladies of the Sacred Heart, who had been deceived by the promise of a ship, were set down without protection in this hell-hole. The only hope which the Mexican government offered to the one hundred persons whom it had proscribed was to suggest to them the ship Bonita, in which one hundred Constitutionalists were to be carried to Mazatlan and in which it was said there was scarcely room for eight persons more. And this took place while Carranza and Dieguez allowed a shipload of Chinese to disembark at Manzanillo. Surely the Chinese were an advantageous exchange for so many religious teachers who were being exiled for no other crime than that of having consecrated their lives to the welfare of the Mexican people; to teach them a religion which forbids robbery even under the Constitutionalist name of *avance*, a religion which teaches the people the difference between right and wrong, in order that they may not be the playthings of anti-Christian atheists and political bandits, a religion which teaches the Mexican people to exercise their rights as citizens and to demand for Catholics that religious liberty which the so-called Laws of Reform, to the destruction of civilization, deny them. Yet these Constitutionalists permit the Mormons, the Chinese and the Hindus to practice their religion and morality. There is plenty of liberty in Mexico for the association of prostitutes, and yet not enough liberty to permit three Catholic women to associate for the purpose of teaching little girls Mathematics and English. What crime have the Constitutionalists found in these latter? None. They themselves are now ashamed of the fable which they invented of a plot and of

arms. But we are wrong. They accuse them of having written over the doors of their houses 'obscene' words such as '*Ave Maria Purissima*,' of having written upon their walls the name of Jesus, of having read in their churches the pastoral letters of their bishops.

" But these Constitutionalists, who have written over the doors of the schools the motto of Juarez, 'Respect for the rights of others is peace'; these men who at the same time open stores to sell their loot, which they have stolen from individuals and Catholic schools; these men whose only thought is to rob peaceful citizens in order to enrich themselves, what do they know or care for the rights of others or for peace? These men, who destroy all the schools and force the children to listen to the lessons of an ignorant, bloodthirsty and immoral woman, like Atala Apodaca and admirers of her, like Valencia and Ortega, what appreciation have they of the right of freedom of education which the Constitution of Mexico itself guarantees?



" What crime have the priests committed; what fault have they been guilty of that secret societies and the revolution hate them so? The Jesuits had the misfortune to have accredited their schools and colleges and to have shown the inferiority and disorder of the government system. They have committed the fault of educating the more cultured class of society and of having merited the esteem of these because of their faithful service and modesty in that work. They have committed the fault of being taken for rich men and of having received the sons of rich men. What matters it that nearly one-fourth of their pupils could not, on account of their poverty, pay even one-half of the small tuition which was asked? 'You are immensely rich,' repeated the parrot Dieguez, when the Rector of the college went to ask permission to get his clothes. An educated person would have tried to find out the truth. The Jesuits are not a business concern, which combines its interests for trade. Their constitution requires complete financial independence in all their houses. One house can not assist another to any considerable extent. Thus there are houses that are rich, and there are colleges that are poor and even poverty-stricken. The latter might fail and the Order could not help them. Each college and institution must live on its own resources and for the benefit of the community in which it is located. The College of Guadalajara did not even have its own building. And the scientific apparatus and furniture were not paid for, but were owed for to the extent of \$70,000 which is still due various Mexicans and foreigners. This is the wealth which 'was being sent to Europe.' These are the millions which they put in their banks.

" The crimes of the Marist Brothers were of the same kind and their

wealth the same. They taught commercial courses and the elementary branches better than the atheist teachers, and their pupils finished their studies better educated, more industrious and more moral than those of their enemies. Secret society fanaticism and Mexican constitutionalism could not stand the scientific and moral superiority of the Catholics, and they preferred to bury the people in ignorance by leaving them without teachers, which they confess they lack, rather than allow 'these pernicious foreigners' to teach them.



"And what was the crime of the Salesian Fathers? They occupied a large building, still unfinished and unpaid for, where they taught the arts and crafts to the children of the common people. They had the very best tools and machinery for carpentry, bookbinding, printing, shoemaking, and the like. They committed the crime of teaching, practically for nothing, trades whereby the sons of the poor workingman would be enabled to earn an honest living. These are the things for which they were hated by these infamous bandits, who claim to work in behalf of the people and yet who have never been able to establish a single school of this kind for the people. These pretenders were ashamed to let a foreigner inspect their poor imitations of industrial schools. Nor will they try to run these machines, which they do not understand, and which they have stolen from their legitimate owners.

"The Fathers of St. John were guilty of even greater crimes: they conducted a free hospital and a free insane asylum. It is incredible, perhaps, but true, that the religious antipathy of Dieguez and the atheists went so far as to condemn such well-known and efficient nurses as the Fathers of St. John. Nay, more, they defamed them. Their newspapers declared that the Fathers of St. John were holding at their asylum persons whom they pretended to be insane for the purpose of getting possession of their property. Dieguez even sent his private secretary to demand the freedom of an insane man who, he maintained, was unlawfully detained. The secretary was not satisfied until he saw the man, who was a violent maniac. Another time General Hill took out a patient and carried him away with him. But the patient, who was almost an idiot, paid no attention to his supposed liberator and at night said he wanted to go home. He was let go and he went back by himself to the asylum.



"The proscribed priests and sisters spent three terrible days in Manzanillo. Yet the promised ship did not arrive. Nor was there any hope of getting out of that dangerous climate. If they did not leave there,

they would die of starvation, disease or anxiety. They engaged to pay \$6,500 for passage on the ship Hong Kong and Mexico City, where they would have to mix with Chinese and to sleep on miserable bare canvas cots in the hold of the ship. But they preferred this to the savage hospitality of the Constitutionalists. The exiles were able to make up among them only half the price for their passage. It became necessary for the captain to accept their promise to pay him upon their arrival at San Francisco, where American citizens would not fail to give assistance in their misfortune to so many foreigners, whose interests the Government in Washington had promised to protect. Will the American people allow outrages such as these to continue? Will they not demand from Dieguez and the Mexican government an indemnity which will permit us to return to our homes and in the meantime to buy food during our exile?

"We all protest against the unjust spoliation of our property, for which we will demand indemnity when a government shall be established. We protest against the barbarity with which they have expelled us. We protest against the savage manner in which they have driven us out of the country for which we have labored so many years. We protest against the according to us of such treatment as would not be accorded the worst criminals. We protest against the indignity offered our flags and our consulates, against the illegality of the verbal decree by which we were expelled and against the execution of that decree which was even more illegal and cruel. We trust that the American people, who are lovers of justice and civilization, will realize that they are in honor bound to defend us in the name of science and humanity, to demand satisfaction for the flagrant violation of the recommendations which were made by them to Carranza and his followers. If this be not done, then the declaration of the Carranzistas will be confirmed that, whatever they do, is done with the knowledge and approbation of the Washington Government."

### III.

#### NUEVO LEON, ZACATECAS AND SALTILLO.

The Archbishop of Monterey, Monsignor Plancarte, is one of the scholars of Mexico, and one who has devoted his great talents to Mexican historical and ethnological research. For forty years he has been at work, during which time he has published valuable contributions to the history of his native country, notably, "*Tamoanchan el Estado de Morelos y el Principio de la Civilizacion en Mexico.*" A sequel to this work, a study of the third period of Mexico's ancient history, entitled: "*La Invacion Chichimeca en la Valle de Mexico,*" was in preparation and almost finished when the revolutionists reached the city of Monterey in the State of Nueva Leon. The archbishop had collected, during his forty years of work, at the expense of great labor and sacrifice, a magnificent library of books and manuscripts, as well as a museum of Mexican antiquities which he had himself excavated. This latter collection was begun in 1883. When Archbishop Plancarte was at Cuernavaca, where he resided before his promotion to Monterey, the Hon. Elihu Root, and the foreign geologists who attended the Geological Congress of Mexico, came to see this splendid collection. Some of the archbishop's archaeological discoveries were outlined to American scientists by Mr. Holmes, of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington, in an article published in a Philadelphia scientific review. The archbishop had scientific correspondence on this subject with the Smithsonian. As Mexico is one of the richest, as well as the most interesting fields for archaeological research, because of its ancient civilization and absorbing story, the work of Archbishop Plancarte was most valuable to scientific men interested in the North American continent. This scientist at least might have escaped the charge of political meddling. His diocese, his studies and his never-ending writings, gave him little thought or interest in anything else.

But such was not the case. When the Carranzistas entered Monterey, it was to commit the same crimes as they had committed in other cities. Homes were entered and taken, the archbishop's being among the first. Then his effects began to disappear. The most valuable books, it is openly said, were taken by Urrieta, a Deputy to Congress, and De la Paz Guerra, Government Secretary of the State of Nuevo Leon, both supposed to be men of honor and character. The labor of forty years was destroyed. The almost completed manuscript of the archbishop's new scientific book went with the rest. No one gained by the destruction

of the manuscripts, for they were thrown away as useless. The museum was looted and its contents taken by people who knew nothing of their value, or who looked upon them as no better than ordinary curios. With these went valuable pictures, family heirlooms, personal belongings, etc. The archbishop was left without the result of his life's labor, and is to-day in exile in San Antonio, with not one single dollar. When I met him he was wearing the borrowed cassock of a simple priest. He had not saved even his pectoral cross.



When the shepherd was stricken, the sheep could expect no protection. Priests were taken publicly to jail; professors were dragged with them. The "liberators," who wanted schools, as they said, had the same respect for the teacher as they had for the preacher. Later on, the foreign priests were freed on the representations of their respective consuls; but they were at once sent out of the country.

Then the Carranzistas turned their attention to the churches. The confessionalists were burned and the temples closed. But this was going pretty far, and the people, who however, had no arms, were muttering. So five churches were allowed to open, but only under such restrictions as to do away altogether with liberty of conscience. Nero and Diocletian had their counterparts in Monterey.

Then followed a reign of terror for the other towns of the State of Nueva Leon. All the school property was seized. Even that belonging to individuals was taken. A monument of antiquity, and the finest church in the State, St. Francis of Monterey, dating from the sixteenth century, was destroyed, and its works of art mutilated.

There were no priests killed in Monterey, but the faithful laity were not so fortunate. Señor Mandin was shot without cause or crime. The nuns were spared from the crowning shame; so far as I can learn, but not so the daughters of many respectable and honest families. Zacatecas saw five priests killed horribly; Coahuila lost by shooting the pastor of St. Peter's; Zamora had the awful spectacle of one of her priests found killed in a field and his body half-eaten by animals. But for Monterey there was only robbery, spoliation, imprisonment, exile, the destruction of schools, and the wiping out of scientific records which some would say were worth many lives.

Why did the archbishop leave? He was ordered to go. They accused him of *receiving* a letter from one of Huerta's ministers, begging his influence to bring about peace. So even the reception of such a letter was considered a crime which merited banishment.



As to the facts I have here set down, they are all from a resident of Nuevo Leon who had every opportunity of knowing the truth. He was well acquainted with the archbishop and all the prominent people of the State. He gave the facts to me in an interview and afterward set them down in writing, offering to have the truth of them attested under oath before a notary. Knowing the man's reputation, I replied that this was not necessary. So he added to his statement an expression of his willingness to swear to the truth of his words at any time.



One of the most informing statements in my possession, because it goes very much into detail, was given by an eye-witness to the treatment of the priests of Zacatecas, already touched upon in a general way. Because this statement is written so that the printing of it in full would immediately expose the name of the person who gave it, I rewrite and summarize, using the facts as they were sworn to.

At ten o'clock on the morning of June 25 the staff-officers of General Villa summoned all the priests of Zacatecas to appear at the headquarters. The priests obeyed, and arrived very soon at the house of Dr. De la Torre, where Villa had taken up his residence. Colonel Beytia, chief of Villa's staff, ordered the Vicar-General to send for the priests who had not yet arrived. One of the officers was appointed to accompany the priests appointed by the Vicar-General, the Colonel saying to him: "If this officer does not come back, you will answer with your head."

At noon twenty-three priests were present, and the Colonel made the following statement: "General Villa asks a million pesos from you. If this sum is not turned in by to-morrow morning, all of you will be shot." The priests answered that it was an impossible request, and they prepared themselves to die.

At twelve o'clock that night the Vicar-General and another priest were taken to the guardhouse by Major Villareal, who said: "You are going to be shot, because you will not give the money." The priest said that they had until ten o'clock in the morning, but the Major answered: "I know nothing about that. I know only the orders I have received." The Major gave the Vicar-General permission, however, to return to the other priests, that he might delegate some one to act as Vicar-General after his death. This done, he returned to the guardhouse. Five mounted soldiers took the two priests in charge and brought them to a hill near the railroad station. They were separated at a ditch and money demanded of each one in turn. The priests said again that they possessed nothing. One said that he had his family home and offered to give them that. He said that he had no right to take money which did not belong to him,

meaning whatever diocesan funds he held. The question was then asked: "What kind of a death do you prefer; to be hanged or shot?" The priests selected shooting. The officer in charge then said to one of the soldiers: "Give me your rifle. How many bullets are in it?" The soldier answered: "Two." "Well," said the officer, "I think two are enough." Bitterly, one of the priests said: "I think so, too." "Why," asked the officer of another priest, "do you allow yourself to be shot instead of handing over the money?" The priest answered: "I possess nothing but a few old books. Take them, but let it be known that I am killed on account of my poverty."

The officer then took them back to the guardhouse, where they slept on the bare floor. The same night Major Villareal informed the other priests that the Vicar-General was to be shot unless they raised the money required. The next morning the good people of the city sent food. At eight o'clock the priests were sent out to see if the money could be collected. They came back at four with ten thousand pesos. Villareal ordered them to secure at least twenty thousand, or he would shoot four, beginning with the Superior. The priests were sent out again on June 27, and collected the required sum of twenty thousand pesos, the people giving the money to save the priests. When this money was paid over, Colonel Beytia demanded one hundred thousand pesos. If the money was not forthcoming, eight would be killed. He said that the graves had already been dug on the hills. He gave the priests paper and told them to make their wills. The priests went out again, but could get nothing, for the rich families had gone away. The officer said: "Go out again and beg from door to door." Again the priests went out and begged. It was pitiful, for even the little children gave them their pennies. This was on Friday. On Saturday, Sunday and Monday they were driven out again under guard. On Sunday no devotions were allowed in the churches. On Tuesday, at four in the morning, the priests were awakened by the cries and laments of a girl in the adjoining room occupied by the Colonel. The reason can be guessed. The girl was kept in the house two days. At eight o'clock that morning the priests returned with a hundred thousand pesos that had been given by the people to save them from death. The money was handed over to Major Alvarez and Major Villareal. Thursday morning the priests were still prisoners and Major Alvarez said that four thousand four hundred and fifty pesos of the one hundred thousand were lacking. When the money was paid over, there was nothing lacking. When they counted the money, two thousand and sixty-six pesos were gone. The priests had to go out and beg again. They asked for a receipt and the permission to leave and go about their duties. At eight o'clock that night the priests were ordered

to the railroad station to be given their freedom. They gathered up their little belongings, but Major Villareal ordered them to leave everything behind, as they would be back in a few minutes. Six officers brought them to the station. One showed them a railroad coach and said: "Get in here, because General Villa wants to see you in Torreon." On the night of July 4, on the train, the officer's were drunk and insulted the priests in vile language. On the fifth they reached Torreon and were turned over to a guard. In the guardhouse they slept on an earthen floor full of vermin. There were twenty priests, all Mexicans except one. The room in which these twenty were confined was about sixteen feet square. In the middle of the night they were awoken by women who had to pass through the room to reach the officers' quarters in the adjoining room. They received no food from the officers, but the people of Torreon gave them food and clothing. They were kept prisoners until Friday. On that day they were loaded into a railroad coach, where they met four Christian Brothers (teachers). There should have been six, but two had been killed brutally at Zacatecas, together with the Chaplain of the Brothers, Father Vega. This killing was done by General Urbina. On Saturday, the train reached Juarez and the priests were sent across the international bridge into the United States. No charge was made against these priests for violating the laws or helping the cause of Huerta. There was no trial; no hearing of the priests' side of the case. The only possible charge that could have been made was that one of the priests, a canon, went to console the dying soldiers at the hospital, when he saw them lying on the bare floor without medical care and attention. Moved by their deplorable condition, he collected some money from the clergy and gave it to the Governor of Zacatecas to help the wounded. That was all the money they gave to the Federals.



An interesting sidelight on this story comes from the town of Jalpa. After the fall of Zacatecas, several Federal soldiers went to Jalpa. The parish priest remained there. The town occupied an advantageous position between two mountains and was very difficult to approach. Knowing what had occurred at other places, the parish priest told his parishioners that they had a right to defend their lives and property, and the honor of their wives and daughters. The people took up arms and defended themselves. The priest is accused of being a Huertista. Stories will probably be circulated, because of his action, that the priest opposed the government.

It is also interesting to note, since the Constitutionalists claim that the rural priests are good and that they are in favor of them, that Father Alba

in the little town of Calera, near Zacatecas, was killed. Reports say that it was by the order of Gen. Eulalio Gutierrez. Is this the Eulalio Gutierrez selected by the Constitutional Convention for President of Mexico?

Zacatecas was attacked twice. During the first attack, the Constitutionalists took a little village about three miles from the city, Guadalupe. The parish priest was attending eight or ten wounded soldiers in his house. The Constitutionalists took the soldiers out and shot them in the yard, and then rode over their dead bodies on horseback, crushing them horribly.



Another statement, sworn to before a notary, is of no less interest, because of the details it gives. While I have the sworn statement itself, I have also had the story verified personally by one of the priests who was tortured. He is a Spanish Benedictine Father, now located at the Benedictine Abbey at Covington, Louisiana. His own story was published in *The Morning Star*, of New Orleans, but this I take from the sworn statements mentioned.

"There were nine Jesuit Fathers in a college at Saltillo, with four scholastics and nine lay Brothers. Three priests were Spanish, one French and the rest Mexicans. The college had a total enrollment of ninety-six students. When Torreon fell the foreign priests were sent away. On the 21st of May, 1914, the Federals withdrew, pillaging the town before leaving, exacting taxes and taking the horses. That same afternoon, at two o'clock, the Constitutionalists came in and killed the remaining Federals. The Constitutionalists came to the college and took possession on the 21st. Villa came to Saltillo the next day at nine o'clock. The Fathers were summoned to headquarters at three o'clock. Six Jesuit Fathers, three Eudists, a Benedictine, and a number of Diocesan priests were ushered into Villa's presence, who began abusing them and asked how many Spaniards there were among them. The Benedictine Father informed Villa that he was a Spaniard. He then ordered the priests to give him a million pesos in coin. They had no money and three were sent out to beg. Colonel Fierro was sent as a guard. At the college they had three thousand and eighty pesos. They gave Villa that. He was not satisfied. Colonel Fierro was informed that the families who were able to help them were out of town. The priests told him that there was nothing to do but beg from door to door. This, however, he would not permit. Villa said: 'It is necessary to put you to the guillotine and to execute all of the Fathers, and I am the only man to do it.' When Villa was speaking, he kept cracking nuts with his teeth and using vile language. He kept the priests prisoners that night in his house. Some Fathers by this time had collected thirteen thousand pesos. Villa let the secular priests go, but kept the others. That night two priests became ill. One of them got permission to go to the English consulate; the other, who was a Jesuit, was not allowed to go out. Villa himself

said: 'Take away that shameless man from here. Put him in a separate room and shoot him in order to cure him.' The priest was in a high fever that night. The sick priest heard Villa say: 'Take this big goat out and shoot him.' He was carried out on a mattress into another room and left alone. In the afternoon Villa came into the room. 'What is the matter with you?' he asked. 'I am sick with fever,' replied the priest. Villa replied: 'I will send you out to be shot.' All of Sunday night and Monday, the priest was left there sick. At midnight on Monday, he was ordered to get up and follow a soldier. Again he was put with the other priests. In the meantime, at the same hour, Colonel Fierro summoned the other priests, and with a naked sword in his hand ordered them to follow him. As they passed through the hallway, they met several soldiers, who were commanded to load their rifles. The priests were lined up, two by two, and taken to an adjoining house which was empty. They were then shown into a large room, illuminated by candles. An officer told them that they had been sentenced to death, and then turning to the other soldiers, he said: 'Whom shall we begin with?' The priests quietly gave one another absolution, and a Jesuit volunteered to be the first. He was taken away and the others left under guard. After a short time, the priests heard a shot and the noise of a body being dragged out. Colonel Fierro and the soldiers returned. One had a horse-hair rope in his hands. He approached another priest and said: 'Your time has come.' The priest himself put the noose around his neck. He was taken to the large room and commanded to reveal the place where the treasures were hidden. The priest answered that he could do no more. The rope was tightened around his neck, and he was choked until he became unconscious and fell to the floor. He recovered consciousness, however, and one of the soldiers drew a revolver and fired a shot. The same soldier ordered him to stand up, and the priest was again asked for treasures. He answered in the same way and was tortured as before. Again the priest came to his senses and was once more choked into unconsciousness. He was then taken to another room, where he found the other Fathers. Later, two others came in and told them what had happened to them. They heard the groans and chokings later of the sick father."



The sick man had the same experiences as the others. They were taken back to Villa's house, and on the way the soldiers who had maltreated them asked forgiveness, saying that they had to obey superior orders.

"Colonel Fierro, with an escort of soldiers, took the priests to the railroad station. The people had gathered around to show sympathy, but the Colonel shouted: 'Those who show any sympathy for these men must go with them.' They were placed in a freight car under guard. One of the officers was drunk. When the train was about to leave Saltillo, a girl fifteen years of age came with blankets for the priests. Villa ordered this girl to be thrown into the car with them, so as to make people think that she was one of their party, but she broke away and escaped. During the journey the drunken Colonel kept threatening to

kill the priests. Once he pointed his revolver at the Superior of the Eudists, but a soldier knocked up his arm and the shot went wild. At Paredon, a prostitute was put into the car. They came to a place where the track was torn up, and horses had to be had for six miles. When asking for the horses, it was announced to the people that ten horses were needed for the priests and one for the prostitute, who was their traveling companion. When they reached the railroad again, they were put into a cattle car without food. During the night the prostitute remained with the officer in charge. At Torreon the priests were kept prisoners. At the barracks they were given food. In the morning they were sent to Chihuahua under the guard of Beytia, General Villa's chief of staff, who was drunk and kept threatening death to a sick priest and to an old one. They had no food all day. They passed the night at Chihuahua on the bare floors. On Sunday they were given a meal and on Sunday night taken to the station again. The following morning they were sent to Juarez and expelled from the Mexican territory. There was no medical attention given them until they arrived at El Paso, where Dr. Paul Gallagher and Dr. Carpenter treated their throats. They had never contributed one dollar to Huerta. No crime was charged against them."

## IV.

### THE PERSECUTION OF THE SISTERS.

Sincerely do I wish that this chapter could be left out of my record. I never approached a task with more reluctance of soul than the one which faces me now. It is abhorrent to even think that men could be so low and bestial as to touch, with unholy hands, the pure women who have dedicated their lives to God and to God's poor; and who have consecrated their white souls to the virginity made forever blessed by the Virgin Mother of our Redeemer. But the story must be told, and, since it must, let a Sister from Mexico who saw with her own eyes the consequences of the unbridled lust let loose by the revolutionists, tell it in her own way. Her statement was sworn to in the most solemn manner before an American archbishop, and in my presence. Signatures are attested by an ecclesiastical notary under the official seal of the diocese. I use nearly all of the document. What follows is translated from the original Spanish:

“The sad and lamentable situation of our Mexican Republic compels me to state under oath the conditions which exist in Mexico as a result of the diabolical persecution of the Catholic Church.

“Our temples are closed and our churches profaned. On our altars the Holy Sacrifice is no longer offered. Our confessionals have been burned in the public squares and there is hardly one that dares to approach the Sacrament of Penance, even in the most remote corner of a home. The Immaculate Lamb no longer comes to aid our souls, and the priest who dares offer the Holy Sacrifice is sentenced to death. Homes are desolated, mothers cry over the death of their sons, husbands are torn from their families for service with the troops, while their children weep at bidding their father the last farewell. Our priests are persecuted. They wander along the road without anything to eat. Prelates have been forced to abandon us and it seems that God Himself has hidden. Church bells no longer ring. The blood of our brothers runs in the streets. Nuns are taken to the barracks and their virginity attacked.

“It appears as if hell had unchained itself and devils had taken possession of men to harm their brothers. Anarchy and revenge have seized their hearts, and the rich are left in the worst misery.

“Since Don Francisco Madero, in 1910, declared war against Don Porfirio Diaz to this date, we have not had a moment of peace, and following Madero's example, many others have arisen in arms to attack the Catholic Church on all sides — some worse than others — so that there is not one single State in the Republic that has not been a victim of horrible outrages.

" The revolutionists have closed the temples and prohibited the Sacraments to the degree that any priest daring to hear confession or offer the Holy Sacrifice is shot. Confessionals and some of the statues of the Saints have been burned in the public squares, accompanied by music and improper speeches. The churches have been so profaned that some of the revolutionists have entered them on horseback. Statues were demolished and relics trampled on. Over the floor the Holy Hosts have been scattered, and in some instances have been fed to the horses.

" In some churches the Carranzistas have impersonated priests, saying Mass, and have occupied the confessionals, hearing confessions and disclosing what has been told to them. (All of this I have seen with my own eyes.)

" The most beautiful of the temples in the Republic, the Church of San Antonio, at Aguascalientes, has been converted into the Legislative Hall. The Church of San Jose, in Queretaro, is now the public library. The wonderful convent of the Discalced Carmelites, also in Queretaro, has been seized, and the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine, who owned a handsome Lyceum, the approximate total value of which was over \$500,000, lost more than \$50,000 spent in repairing it. The colleges of the Lazarist Fathers, Jesuits, and many others have perished. The property of the Church has been appropriated and many of the ecclesiastical archives have been burned. The orders of nuns have been expelled from the Republic, giving them only a half hour's time to leave, and without allowing them to take the least piece of wearing apparel. Many religious have been taken to the barracks and the prison, where their chastity has been in grave danger. From the Catholic schools the furniture has been stolen. Immorality has extended to such a degree that not only virginity has been violated, but nuns have been taken away by force and are being subjected to the most horrible suffering.

" In Mexico City I have seen with the utmost regret many religious who have been victims of the unbridled passions of the soldiers. Many I found bemoaning their misfortune, being about to become mothers, some in their own homes and others in maternity hospitals. Others have allowed themselves to be carried away by their misfortune and have given up all, filled with desperation and shame. They complain against God, saying that they have been abandoned by Him.

" Religious of various orders have so dressed themselves, and so go about, as to hide the fact that they are nuns, for fear that the revolutionists may carry them away. Some priests worthy of full credit, have told me that, in a hospital located in —, there are fifty religious that were taken away by the soldiers, out of which forty-five are about to become mothers, notwithstanding the fact that they have religious vocations and were bound by vows.

" In the —, in Mexico City, are others in this same condition and others also in the hospital of —. In Celaya and Mexico City I have seen many others that were obliged to join the Red Cross, and under this pretext were held as slaves, treated by the soldiers as though they were their own women and not giving any attention to the sick. In a great many cases young women, after having been compelled to lead this life, were thrown out into the street, some being killed as though they were animals.

"As to the clergy! What have the ministers of God not suffered? Fathers \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (at present in the United States) can tell. They were under sentence of death only because they directed Catholic labor societies. Many have been shot, and those having any property have been exiled and their property seized. In Guadalajara the clergy in its entirety was exiled, having been compelled to leave in box and cattle cars, their departure being accompanied by a band playing burlesque music amidst mockery and hooting. Eight days later the religious were compelled to leave and, thank God, women were brave enough to arm themselves with stones to use if music was played upon their leaving.

"The clergy in Torreon and Zacatecas were offered for ransom, and after obtaining \$100,000, were compelled to pave the streets. Many were forced to enlist with the army, while others were shot. Lastly, they were exiled without being allowed to take any clothing or money.

"The clergy in Queretaro were imprisoned and exceedingly heavy fines imposed upon them and were later exiled.

"Many Fathers have been in the penitentiary in Mexico City, while others are at present used as servants. When they are discharged they must go without clothing—many of them being obliged to dress as women in order to leave. In some towns they have been locked up together with bad women and threatened with death if they resisted.

"I have seen used as saddle blankets and ornaments on the horses, the chasubles, stoles, maniples, girdles, pluvial capes and altar linen; while women wore the copes, and the corporals were used as handkerchiefs. The holy vases have been profaned in sundry ways. After drinking from them, the soldiers used them as night vessels, which they afterwards threw into the street. In some towns the chalice has been burned and the Hosts scattered on the floor. Soldiers have sacrilegiously eaten them and, as before said, they have also been fed to the horses. Statues were used as targets until they fell to the floor. I have seen wagonloads of statues that were on their way to be burned; some I was fortunate enough to save, by daring to address the chief, telling him that I would rather be burned before the statue of my Holy Mother. The best sculptures have been taken away to the museums. The Del Carmen Church, in Queretaro, was to have been transformed into a dance hall, but I do not know whether the intended work has been completed. In other churches the images of Christ have also been shot at.

"On the road from \_\_\_\_\_ to Mexico City I found seven religious who asked to be directed to a maternity hospital, claiming not to be religious, but the fact that they were religious was very evident from their manner of speaking. They related to me how they were able to escape from the mountains where the revolutionists had held them. I tried to console them, but it was useless. They said that they were already condemned and abandoned by God, and were in such a despairing condition that they cursed the hour of their profession.

"All these horrible things have compelled me to come to \_\_\_\_\_ as a refugee, bringing with me seven religious, of whom I was Prioress, in order to bring them to safety and away from the personal persecution that some were subjected to. It is a fact that they were being searched for by means of photographs, and when found would have been taken away and killed if they resisted.

"Our community, the \_\_\_\_\_, was located in the city of \_\_\_\_\_, where I left on July 9 for \_\_\_\_\_, in the hopes of making a new home, bringing with me ten postulants and other religious, to get away from the danger which threatened them in \_\_\_\_\_. I left there other religious awaiting the results of my new foundation in \_\_\_\_\_, who were to join me later. Only with great difficulty was I able to keep them together and alive, as their families had lost all their property; consequently their dowries were gone and I had not even a single cent. On the 27th of July all the Orders were expelled from \_\_\_\_\_, including ourselves, and we were given twenty-four hours' time to leave the country.

"Not having any means, I presented myself to the local military chief, \_\_\_\_\_, begging him to intercede in our favor with Governor \_\_\_\_\_, so that we might be allowed two or three months to look for funds with which to leave the country. This gentleman told me that he was a Catholic, and advised me to leave the Republic as soon as possible if we did not want to suffer the same outrages that many others went through in other places. He offered me all kinds of guarantees and told me how to save my nuns from the many dangers that threatened them.

"To this gentleman I also came after having scaled the walls of the Church of \_\_\_\_\_ in order to save four sculptures and other altar ornaments. In this case I was incurring a fault which was subject to the death penalty as punishment. Not only was I forgiven for this, but he gave me a safe conduct to avoid being molested by any one. I take the liberty of recommending him as a good man. I am very grateful to him.

"On the 28th of August, I returned to \_\_\_\_\_ to bring the other religious that remained there, in order that we might leave the Republic together. Our religious were badly persecuted in \_\_\_\_\_ and had to be divided and placed in private homes to avoid their being taken to the barracks.

"I returned to \_\_\_\_\_ with my nuns, and on the road I met several spies who injured us greatly. In a rented house we only had three rooms for twenty-four religious and novices, and each day I had to go out in search for bread to eat. They were deprived of hearing Mass and receiving Communion. God only knows what I suffered to liberate them from danger and obtain food.

"For twenty-two days I was scarcely able to sleep, fearing that at any moment the house would be attacked and the nuns stolen. They were obliged to sleep on the floor of one room after offering to God the sacrifices of the day.

"Some days I was obliged to change houses as often as three times, since our hiding-places had been discovered, which fact the officer (my friend) would tell me. The spies denounced us again. I was compelled to leave with seven for the \_\_\_\_\_, and beg of foreign prelates that they permit me to make a new home, where I could safely place the other religious that I had under my charge, and who are at present hiding in the city of \_\_\_\_\_, Mexico.

"I leave to God the fulfillment of His holy will and, in the meantime, pray Him to remedy the troubles of the Mexican Republic and preserve the President of the United States of America, so that he may stop the numerous calamities that have fallen upon the Mexican Church."

Names of persons and places which might identify the Sister Superior who wrote the above statement, or her friends, have been eliminated for reasons already given; but, in this case especially, because some of the Sisters have not yet escaped, and the devoted Superior, supplied with the necessary money by The Catholic Church Extension Society, has returned to Mexico to find them and bring them to a place of safety.

No further comment on this sworn statement is necessary.

If any doubt remains as to the certainty of these abominable outrages, the following, which is a sworn statement before a notary, by one of the most prominent parish priests of Mexico City, ought to put it to rest: "The stories regarding outrages against Sisters are so common in the City of Mexico that they are believed by all. I have never heard a denial even by those whose interest it would be to disprove them. The common information is to the effect that many Sisters are pregnant, and others suffering from loathsome diseases, because of assaults upon them by revolutionary soldiers."

Another sworn statement, for the publication of which full permission was given by the person making it, testifies to the same effect. The part of the statement which concerns the outrages is as follows:

"I have it on the authority of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ (no permission to publish this name, as the doctor is still in Mexico), physician in the street called \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_, Mexico, that in his own private house there were seventeen Sisters who had been outraged by revolutionists, and were in a pregnant condition. I also know that other Sisters in the same condition were in the \_\_\_\_\_ Asylum of Mexico City."

(Signed) N. CORONA.

"State of Texas,      }  
"County of Galveston.      }

Sworn to and subscribed before me on this 24th day of October, 1914.

(Signed) H. REBAUD,

[SEAL]      Notary Public for Galveston County, Texas.



On the same day the following sworn statement was given me:

"I know that one month ago, to my certain knowledge, Sisters outraged by revolutionists and in a pregnant condition were in the \_\_\_\_\_ Asylum of Mexico City. This house is in charge of Miss \_\_\_\_\_, (Street \_\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_. The stories of the outrages on Sisters are so commonly spoken of in Mexico City as to vanquish all thought of their not having occurred. Naturally, the names of the Sisters, and the houses they are in, were kept as secret as possible, in view of the future of the poor, unfortunate victims themselves.

..... Superior of \_\_\_\_\_ Church.

"State of Texas,      }  
"County of Galveston.      }

. Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of October, 1914.

(Signed) H. REBAUD,

[SEAL]

Notary Public for Galveston County, Texas.



The next statement is signed by the Superior-General of one of the large teaching orders of Mexico. The good reputation and high character of the Superior-General is attested by two archbishops, who in witness thereto have signed the original document, which is in my possession:

"Having been requested to inform you of my knowledge regarding the outrages suffered by the religious in Mexico at the hands of the revolutionists, I can truthfully give the following information:

"While the Mother Superior of \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ Sisters of \_\_\_\_\_, was in Mexico during the month of June last, and having heard that there had arrived a number of religious that had been outraged, filled with indignation and pain, she asked permission of the Mother-General to investigate the whereabouts of these religious, in the hope of offering them refuge and taking care of them, if it were possible. Her first efforts were directed to the \_\_\_\_\_ Hospital, where it was stated these religious would be found. Upon calling there, she was informed of the *veracity of these charges*, but was advised that the nuns had already been transferred to the religious' house of \_\_\_\_\_. Finding that they were already being taken care of, she made no further inquiries in this direction, in view of the fact that it was very painful and mortifying to all."



The following is an extract from a letter dated, "Mexico City, October 25, 1914." Original is in the hands of a gentleman in San Antonio, Texas:

"Concerning the subject you speak of in your letter (the outrages), I can tell you that, only three months ago, a lady asked me to receive in my sanitarium three nuns from Durango who were in the said condition."



Here is a translation from the columns of *El Presente*, a Mexican paper published in the Spanish language at San Antonio, Texas. The date of the issue from which the article is taken is November 7, 1914.

"But let us not mislead ourselves. We said that the revolution completely ignored the manly virtue of respect towards women, and the irrefutable evidence is at hand. Even if some of our readers who are not accustomed to read in print of certain criminal deeds, it is necessary to state that the Constitutional horde not only devoted themselves to stealing, murdering and incendiaryism, but, worst of all, are the violators of unfortunate women and are guilty of all kinds of wrongs and indignities. In every city, in every town, and in every country place, they have left the ravages of their visit. While we could specifically give

names, places and dates, we will not do so for fear of being considered chroniclers of dishonor and lost virginity.

" Yet there is still more. The Mexican revolutionists have committed the greatest crime that could be committed, the one that can hardly be conceived by any civilized people of the present day. We refer to the infamous and monstrous outrages upon the nuns in Mexico."



The refinement of deviltry could scarcely surpass what the following from signed statement of a Vicar-General, the original of which is in my possession, narrates:

"A priest of the same diocese (\_\_\_\_\_) was locked in a room with a woman of evil repute. Then they (the revolutionists) calumniated him, and gave him a mock trial before a "Council of War," and sentenced him to be burned to death. They did not carry this sentence out, but the priest became mad. He lost his reason for three days. Then they brought him to \_\_\_\_\_ and let him go free."

Why did they not finish their work? A ruined reputation is not preferable to a martyr's crown.



This letter comes from Toluca. I have the original, which was written by the daughter of a respectable family of that city, a lady who had devoted herself to charitable works. It was addressed to her pastor, who was then and still is in exile in the United States:

"I am going to ask you a question. If one should fall into the hands of \_\_\_\_\_ (revolutionists), would it not be preferable to end one's life than to suffer their usual outrages? I did not think that this would ever come, and therefore never made this inquiry before, but the situation seems very probable now. Had we not full confidence in our good God, I believe we would perish. What we expected did not happen, but what we never imagined took place. There is a feeling of pain, fear, indignation and shame in the face of so many horrible things."

Should she commit suicide rather than suffer what others suffered? God of Heaven! and this is the twentieth century of the Christian dispensation, but Christians remain unmoved.



To these I add a sworn statement, already published in *America*, addressed to the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, Secretary of State, and which is, therefore, to be found in the archives of the State Department at Washington:

(COPY)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 8, 1914.

To His Excellency, The Hon. W. J. Bryan, Secretary of State:

SIR,— On July 22 last I had the honor of addressing your Excellency

on the subject of the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico as practiced by the revolutionary parties now in power in that country.

The Third Assistant Secretary of State, under date of July 24, acknowledged receipt of my letter.

Since then I have made the acquaintance of the Rev. R. H. Tierney, editor of the Catholic paper *America*, published in New York City, who writes me that he visited you concerning this subject, and that your Excellency wished to hear me on the same matter. I have thought it well, therefore, to note down for your convenience the principal points, and I wish to say that I have written down nothing of which I am not fully aware and can vouch for personally. I have lived in Mexico twenty-three years, am a German by birth, by religion a Lutheran, and am sixty years of age.

I know of Catholic clergymen, who under pain of death were forced to sweep the streets of a city and do menial work for common, illiterate soldiers.

Of a bishop, seventy years old, deported to the penal colony on the Pacific Coast.

Of several priests in the Monterey penitentiary as late as August 30, last.

Of a parish priest, eighty years old, so tortured that he lost his reason.

Of many deported to Texas, both Mexicans and foreigners.

Of priests and sisters tortured by hanging and strangling.

Of a priest in hiding who was enticed out to confess a person and instead was thrown into a dungeon.

Of forty Sisters of Charity who have been violated, of which number four are known to me, and one of these has become demented.

I have been instrumental in saving six Sisters and seven girl pupils from the same fate.

Of an Englishman who tried to save the personal effects of these thirteen women, being fined \$2,000 for the attempt.

Of all the confessionals of the Monterey district churches being piled in a public square and burned.

Of valuable paintings stolen from churches and supposedly brought to the United States by filibusters.

Of Constitutional soldiers, led by a man who is now Governor of a State in Mexico, doing on the altar what decency does not permit me to say.

Of doing the same at another church, into the chalice, and making the priest drink of it.

Of decrees published by those now Governors of States, prohibiting the practice of religion, and closing the churches, convents and schools.

I am respectfully your humble servant,

(Signed) MARTIN STECKER.

117 B Street S. E.  
District of Columbia:

Martin Stecker, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that the foregoing is a true copy of a letter sent by him to the Hon. Wm. J. Bryan, and that the same is in all substantial particulars a true statement of facts.

MARTIN STECKER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of October, 1914.  
CHARLES M. BIRCKHEAD,  
*Notary Public, D. C.*

Decency refuses permission to chronicle more. Even as these statements stand I have hesitated about printing all of them, but if the story is to be told it must be told as it is. Whatever good is to come out of it for the poor refugees, and the almost destroyed church in Mexico, will come only when a fair-minded and just people have the truth.

How do *you* like it? Put your own religious teachers and pastors in the same place and judge.

## V.

### YUCATAN.

The case of Yucatan is one of the saddest in the history of the Mexican persecutions. Not because the people and the Church were treated more severely than in other places, but because Yucatan had not been in rebellion at all, and had kept the peace. The citizens of the State simply accepted conditions as they were. The people of Yucatan are a very quiet and industrious people. They ask for nothing better than such quiet and industry. Stories published some years ago by an American magazine concerning "barbarities" in Yucatan were bitterly resented by the people. No section of Mexico has had more prosperity, considering everything, than the State of Yucatan. The fact that the people did not take up arms is perhaps one of the most eloquent testimonies that could be given as to the satisfactory condition of the State.

The great industry of Yucatan is the growing of hemp. The country could, if the people so desired, grow a great many other things, but the hemp industry is very profitable. Most of it is sold in the United States or through American merchants. The port of the state is called Progresso. It is the Mexican terminus of the Ward Line steamers from New York. The city of Merida, the capital, as well as the state, is rich in antiquities connected with the history of Mexico. Excavations have been made which have resulted in rich archaeological treasures. One of the greatest archaeologists was the former Archbishop of Merida, a native Mexican, by birth of Indian blood. He was one of Mexico's most learned men and did in the South what Archbishop Plancarte was doing in the North. He had published valuable works which attracted the attention of scientists everywhere. The present Archbishop of Yucatan is a native Mexican of German descent, a man of very great ability and a wise administrator. He has made a decided mark on the Church in his diocese, and is loved and revered by his people.



Although Yucatan was, as I already said, peaceful and industrious, and although it was taken over by the revolutionists without fighting, nevertheless the first effort made was to bleed the people. As soon as the Constitutional Governor Avila took command, a "loan" of \$8,000,000 was imposed upon the hemp growers. The decree calling for this robbery was printed in *La Revista de Yucatan* on September 29, 1914. The decree

gives, as a reason for the impost, that the northern section of Mexico suffered great dangers; that its fields were made barren and its cattle destroyed, so as to make it impossible to contribute in a financial way "to the complete reestablishment of order." The decree goes on to say that "the State of Yucatan has been the only one not suffering the consequences of a civil war, and able to preserve all its fountains of wealth, which are in full production." The impost of \$8,000,000 was made on all the inhabitants of the State who have a capital of \$100,000 or more. The "loan" was compulsory and individuals subject to it were obliged to *pay within five days*.

Before issuing this decree, and also before the expulsion of the clergy and the closing of the churches, the Constitutionalists took good care to disarm the people. Not a gun was left in Yucatan. Resistance was impossible. This was only following the plans already put into force in other states. The Constitutionalists imposed their will in the name of the people, whether the people wanted it or not. Robbery under these circumstances is easy. One can not object too strenuously when the robber has a gun and the victim is weaponless.

The condition of the hemp growers was, however, not so favorable as the decree intimated. It was not easy for them to raise \$8,000,000 in five days, with the consequences of war in other states and in Europe upon the country. They complained very bitterly, mentioning their business debts. If they could not pay these, they would be ruined. The paying of the Constitutional impost meant paralyzing the industries of Yucatan.



But there is a side light also to be thrown upon the difficulty—currency. While Yucatan had more coin than perhaps any other section of Mexico, yet the coin had constantly been withdrawn from circulation. The people were hoarding it, because they knew very well that every effort was being made by the revolutionists to get all the coin of the country into their hands. Instead of coin the revolutionists had issued paper money. The paper money of Carranza and Villa was practically worthless, and even the paper issued by the Mexican banks was, while I was in Texas, valued only at about 16 cents on the dollar. Americans bought it at 16 cents to pay their bills in Mexico where it had to be taken at face value. Mexican producers were, therefore, being paid at the rate of 16 cents on the dollar for what they were exporting. To make matters worse, the Constitutionalists issued a decree obliging all people having coin or bank notes, to put them in circulation, or be punished severely. It will be remembered that more than one Mexican "patriot" decamped with considerable money. He always took his money

out in coin or transferred it to Europe. There is a good reason why the present "patriots" should force the Mexican people to put their coin in circulation and accept paper instead. The effect on the currency and on business of such a move can easily be imagined. The position of the planters of Yucatan was an unenviable one.

However, the Governor was willing to relieve the situation as far as he could, but not to the extent of giving up the "loan." *He believed it by declaring that for six months the planters should not be obliged to pay any other debts.* He intended putting on another "loan" of from \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 and hitting the smaller planters with it; so it was declared in another decree that no one in Yucatan should be obliged to pay his business debts for a period of six months. There was then no excuse for the planters. The Constitutional government was their only debtor—for six months; but after that time they would have to pay the other debts in the face of hard times and a debased currency. There was no recourse, for the guns were aimed at them. One planter's share was \$400,000. A little more "liberty" of this kind in Yucatan and the industries of the state would be no more.

Then the Constitutionalists tackled the Church, but it was necessary now to take a further measure of precaution, so the Governor issued Decree No. 18, which "under authority vested in him by the First Chief of the Constitutional Army," considered: "that the government should aim to purify all social elements, in order to prepare for a vigorous revival of constitutional government—considering, secondly, that as the national press is amongst these elements it must have immediate attention, as up to the present time, editors have in their profession lacked the necessary social guarantee." (What this means, of course, was known only to the government. Editors have never been considered *social* beings by their contributors; and the Governor of Yucatan had become quite a contributor to the press, with decrees at least.) So the Governor ordered that on the very next day all newspapers in the state should cease publication. And further, "that before resuming publication they would have to apply to the Governor for a permit, setting forth qualifications and proofs of honesty, morality and capacity to direct such a publication." The Governor offered to give such permits "to those who in his opinion possessed the necessary qualifications."

The editors had to have their honesty passed upon by the greatest set of thieves that ever operated in the Republic of Mexico; their morality passed upon by the representatives of the most bestial soldiery that ever inflicted themselves upon a peaceful populace. The liberty of the press went out by the scratch of a governor's pen. Yet this is the government in which we Americans place our hopes for peace in Mexico.

Only last week I read a laudatory editorial on Carranza in one of the most prominent American dailies. I wonder how the writer of the editorial would enjoy having his hero pass upon his honesty and morality.



All means of defense gone, and the press muzzled, then came the destruction of the Church. Archbishop and priests were exiled. The foreign priests, of course, went first. All residing in the State of Yucatan for less than thirty years had to go within five days' time. Sixty-five arrived in Cuba penniless. If they did not go peacefully, violence was threatened. They had already resorted to violence in Campeche. So the clergy were expelled as "pernicious foreigners," but not without protest. The ladies of Yucatan took up their cause and forwarded the following to the governor:

*"To the Honorable Governor:*

"We have come to intercede on behalf of those who have lived on the Yucatan soil, loving it as their own, dividing the sorrows and happiness of our land with us, with no other end than to propagate the doctrine of love, peace and mercy; with no other idea than to give consolation to the fallen, courage to the harassed and hope to the despairing; with no other arms of defense than the image of Him who ordered us to love one another as brothers; with no other politics than planting seeds of goodness, charity and the fulfilment of our duty; and with no other defense or shelter than faith in our laws and the guarantees of the Yucatan land as a mother to all living on her soil. Those men to-day, against whom no shade of wrong can be found in Yucatan or anywhere else, in whose lives society has never found the least flaw, are cruelly expelled from this land without any wrong-doing, but solely for political reasons to which they are entirely foreign. Our spirit can not conciliate this with the points of liberty and democracy stated in the Constitution. Those for whom we ask justice have had no part in the battles that have stained with blood our country and filled our homes with sorrow and pain. Here in Yucatan we do not and can not understand the danger that would compel the exiling of the priests, as from these priests that are to-day exiled we have only received lessons of piety, beneficial deeds and a public education. We desire for our children, for our brothers, and for all the sons of this Yucatan soil who want to keep their beliefs and their ideals as their richest social inheritance, the Christian education which is the most becoming for the safeguarding of dignity and nobility of life. You, Señor Governor, no doubt retain amongst your most pleasing remembrances those of your school days, and from which you have unquestionably found much consolation more than once. Therefore, Sir, we dare invoke the sweet, maternal love that, even after death, lives in your mind as a benediction from the regions of eternity, and are, therefore, sending to you our manifestation of pain and respectful supplication against the expulsion of foreign priests. We ask in the name of all Yucatan, in the name of all that live and love our land, and in the name of the blessed woman to whom you gave the sweet title of 'mother,'

and who from Heaven joins us in our request, that you do not consent to close the Yucatan soil to those priests, and that they may not receive as compensation for their labors for good and peace, the bitterness of exile. We ask that you do this for our people in the same spirit as if you were placing the case before your own father, and as if you wanted to deed a title of just pride to your son."

"Requested in Merida on the 5th of the month of October, 1914."

The above document will be interesting to those who assert that these expulsions of clergymen were desired by the people. It is at once a testimony to the priests themselves, to the religious character of the people of Yucatan and to the efficiency of the Church in that State.

The appeal to the "liberties" guaranteed under the Constitution is certainly appropriate, when made to a Constitutional Governor; but not timely, for Villareal said: "We want to get along awhile without our Constitution."



I have set down this story of Yucatan, not as a solitary example of overriding the laws and the Constitution of Mexico, but simply as an example of the *peaceful* actions of the Constitutionalists. It is true that the Governor of Yucatan did not murder any priests, nor did his soldiers outrage any Sisters, but he murdered the free press and outraged the laws. Yet we Americans expect that from such actions will come peace, tranquillity, and the revival of industry to the Republic of Mexico.

## VI.

### THE CAMPAIGN OF CALUMNY.

General Antonio I. Villareal was the president of the Constitutional convention at Aguascalientes. This convention was called for the purpose of bringing peace to Mexico. Its keynote was supposed to be *conciliation*. It began with a declaration of war against the Church, and ended with a declaration of war against the chief of the Revolution. It has plunged Mexico once more into a bath of blood. Villa is in arms against Carranza. They are flinging charges at one another; and, incidentally, proving from their own mouths the charges that I make in this book. In the manifesto of General Villa against his rival, an original copy of which is in my possession, he charges his superior with having "interfered with liberty of conscience by the persecution of the Church; of having permitted governors to suppress religion, of imposing penalties on religious practices authorized by law, of outraging profoundly the religious feelings of the people through acts condemned by civilization and the rights of nations."



Carranza's answer is interesting. He says:

"If General Villa were capable of weighing the meaning of what they wrote for him to sign, he would not have put himself in such an unseemly situation by formulating the charges against me, because it was he himself who exaggerated this just resentment of the Constitutional party against the members of the Catholic clergy for sustaining the dictatorship. He went so far as to cause real alarm or indignation among all classes of society.

"The fact is that General Villa, who now seeks an agreement with the clergy by showing himself so respectful toward religion and religious practices, did, in every place he occupied during the campaign, expel the priests, close the churches, and forbid religious exercises. And in Zacatecas his anti-religious fanaticism reached a climax which contrasts greatly with his present Christian meekness. He expelled eleven priests of different nationalities, of whom three were French, and of these no one yet knows their resting-place.

"It is high time to recall to General Villa in this regard the hearty congratulation which he sent to General Antonio I. Villareal, Governor of Nueva Leon, when the latter published a decree in which he restricted

religious exercises and forbade Confession. The following is the text of the congratulatory message:

“‘ CHIHUAHUA, July 29.

“‘ General Antonio I. Villareal,—I congratulate you heartily and enthusiastically on your decree imposing restrictions on the clergy in the State over which you worthily rule. And already I am hastening to follow your wise example, because, like yourself, I think that one of the greatest enemies of our progress and liberties has been the corrupt clergy who have so long ruled in our country. I salute you affectionately.

“‘ GENERAL-IN-CHIEF FRANCISCO VILLA.’”



This effort on the part of General Carranza to shift the blame for outrages against liberty of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution weakens when it is understood that at no time before the rupture of the relations of the two leaders was General Villa anything but a subordinate of General Carranza. The latter claimed the title and rights of “First Chief,” quarreled with the Aguascalientes Convention for daring to suggest that it was more powerful than he, and quarreled with Villa himself when he gave his allegiance to that body. On the other hand, after the Battle of Torreon, when Villa was certainly at the height of his power and all looked for him to proclaim his attitude and take the leadership, he gave out a statement, which was published in all the American and Mexican papers, acknowledging his position of inferiority to that of Carranza, hailing him as his Chief, and proclaiming his loyalty to him. This declaration Carranza accepted.

All this makes very plain the fact that General Carranza was the man who directed the policy of the Revolutionists; who was behind him makes little difference. It is certain that General Villa was not. He was acting under the orders, or according to the known policy of the First Chief. The responsibility rests with General Carranza.

It is not without significance that the moment General Villa broke with his Chief, his policy toward religion changed; and it was he who launched the charges of persecution and invasion of the rights of conscience against his former superior. Villa’s name, it is true, appears in the accounts of the torturing of priests, but Villa’s own actions were few. His officers, especially Colonel Fierro, seemed to take the actual work out of his hands. Much was done in Villa’s name of which he probably knew very little. His account was bad enough. How much did certain officers add to it without his authority or with the certainty that he could not interfere? Villa’s later actions do not agree with his former ones; while Carranza began as a persecutor at Durango and persecutes still in the State of Vera Cruz.



This same Antonio I. Villareal, to whom General Carranza referred above, is, I believe, the man upon whom the chief responsibility for the persecutions rests. It was he who opened the convention of Aguascalientes with an attack upon the Church, from which I take the following:

"One of our main objects should be to annihilate our enemy, so that he may be absolutely dead. . . . *Our Constitution prohibits confiscation; therefore we want to live a little time without our Constitution.* . . . We must tear from the enemy the foundations upon which a new revolution may be builded. We must tear from him his properties. We must make him impotent, as an enemy without gold is an enemy at whom we may laugh. Our enemy is privilege, the privilege maintained from the pulpit through the services of the entire Christian clergy. . . . We must tear away the wealth of the powerful and must also comply with the Laws of Reform, which refer to the wealth of the clergy. In the same manner that the Laws of Reform nationalize the property of the clergy, we must nationalize the property of privilege for the welfare of this Republic. It has been done. . . . From the clergy we must tear the property which they acquired under the conciliatory policy of General Diaz. They have a right to use the temples consecrated to religion, but no right to own, as they do, convents and beautiful buildings, all of which the priests call 'educational property,' but are nothing else than foundations of perversion for children's minds.

"The Revolution should not attempt anything against liberty of conscience or liberty of worship. During the period of activity it was just and *it has been done*. It was in order to punish the clergy that associated with Huerta and the Catholics that furnished him money; but past that period, we should, like good Liberals, respect all worship, but never allow our children to be poisoned. It is better to prohibit the teachings of the clergy than religion. Let them continue to preach, but prohibit their teaching-rights."



From this speech, which was received with great applause by the convention, some things stand out very strongly. First, that the Constitutionalists do not want the Constitution until they have finished robbing, raping and murdering. No one can read anything else out of the discourse. Second, after they have taken all they can get, and have committed all the atrocities in the calendar of crimes, then they want to sit down for a period of merited rest, with the money they have gathered, and ask the Republic to give them and their ill-gotten gains the protection of the law. Third, they desire to take away from the Church everything but the use of the church buildings; that is, such of them as have not, at that time, been turned to other uses. This, of course, means

liberty of conscience and worship; *but the clergy must not do any more than pray in the churches. They will not be permitted to teach, to administer the Sacraments, to attend the dying, or, in fact, carry out their ministry in any way except by prayer.*

How would the Protestants of the United States like to be in this condition? Supposing the shoe were on the other foot, would it pinch? And yet a great many of our Protestant fellow-citizens hope for great things in Mexico from the Constitutional régime.



It is interesting to ask how the clergy are supposed to live under these circumstances. According to Constitutional decree, copies of which I have, they are forbidden to ask offerings or tithes. Now, all offerings and tithes for the support of religion in Mexico have been free-will offerings. No one has been taxed for the Church. No one has been forced to pay anything. In some sections of the Republic the old tithe custom has been kept up by the people themselves; in other sections religion is supported only through offerings at baptism, marriages and funerals; but these, too, are forbidden, and forbidden under severest penalties. So liberty of worship in Mexico is to consist of this: The clergy can not teach, therefore can not train candidates for the priesthood in seminaries. That disposes of the question of having priests; there can be none. It might be said that the deficiency can be made up from other countries; but a foreign clergy is prohibited in Mexico, and all the foreign clergy have already been expelled. The clergy has the full right and permission to pray, when it is provided that there will be no clergy at all to offer the prayers. Again, those priests who remain may not take up collections, may not receive offerings when people are accustomed to make them, may not live by their labor of love at all. In fear lest some of them could make a living otherwise, the law is to be enforced that they may not have investments, and may not even leave their family legacies to the upkeep of religion. This is "liberty of conscience." This is "freedom of worship." This is "democratic government." With this program the Constitutionalists come before the American people to ask for sympathy and assistance; and have had it.



How would this affect the Protestant missionaries in Mexico? They want it because they desire the destruction of the Catholic Church. Are they going to live within the law, or stand up against the law? They will, of course, live within the law; but if foreign priests are not allowed, foreign ministers can not be allowed either. If they are, the law is violated. If they violate the law and live in Mexico, how about their

teaching? How about the many existing Protestant schools and colleges? Will an exception be made in favor of these? If so, Protestants will be demanding the special privileges against which General Villareal shouts. If Protestants build churches, will not these also be confiscated? But, above all, what of the future? The aim of all Protestant missionary activity is to found Protestantism permanently. Missions call for beginnings only. The day is looked forward to when the output from the missionary treasury will cease, and the converts support their own church. The missions are then said to be on a "self-supporting basis." Donors to missions in the United States are encouraged with the hope that many of their missions will soon be in that condition. Very well; how soon will the Mexican Protestant missions arrive at that happy state under these laws, if the people may not give to the support of their work, even after it has been established? In their mad desire to kill off the Catholic Church, are not many of these reverend "generals" and "colonels" killing the goose that laid the golden egg for them? But what need they care? They no longer need the goose.



How does it come that General Villareal can utter such sentiments — utter them with impunity — and even win applause? It has come about because of a campaign of calumny, the most outrageous that has ever occurred in the history of the world. It is perfectly true that isolated examples can be found everywhere of priests who have been unfaithful to their holy obligations, as of ministers who have been anything but examples to their flocks; but that is only weak human nature occasionally showing itself. The overwhelming majority of the clergy of Mexico have been faithful, both to their vows and to their duties. Even Señor Zubaran, who attempted to reply to Cardinal O'Connell, acknowledges this of the rank and file of the country priests; but the most exemplary priests in Mexico are the hard-working priests of the populous city parishes; and the most pious of all have been the religious who were thrown out in a body. The most abominable stories have been circulated among the people of irregularities of the clergy, not forgetting even to slander individuals. For example, recently they sent through every Mexican paper accusations of rape against Father Vincente Latorre. His victim was supposed to be Miss Josefina Pimentel, and the priest was supposed to be in prison for his crime. The American-Mexican paper, *El Presente*, had the following about this charge in its issue of November 7, 1914:

"We have taken pains to investigate this, and information shows that it is untrue. Accusations of all kinds directed to the clergy in Mexico are

all too frequent, and, for reasons or pretext always unfounded, the Carranzistas have exiled them. Let us not forget the accusation made of finding arms and ammunition in the temple of Santo Domingo, which was found to be a great untruth and which the Carranzistas themselves had to correct.

"This is not a religious organ, nor have we any political agreement with the Church, but we aim to be defenders of truth and justice, and, therefore, believe the action of our colleagues a little hasty in accepting scandalous and untrue reports such as these.

"As regards Miss Pimentel, we are assured that she is not known in Mexico."



The editor states the truth. When the churches were looted, stories were given out that arms were found in them, skeletons of murdered people and skeletons of babies. No one in Mexico believes these stories except the ignorant; but they serve their purpose. Most of them are for American consumption, and American consumption only.

What are the facts regarding the condition of the Catholic Church in Mexico? Perhaps the best answer is the letter already quoted from the ladies of Yucatan. Read it over again; it is enlightening. Then add to it the following, which is the translation of a signed statement made to me, and now in my possession, by a lawyer from Mexico, a writer of distinction and note:

"I had not written to you, according to my promise, because I was awaiting the confirmation of some very important news from Mexico relating to a fact which fully corroborates an opinion of mine.

"This news has just been confirmed by my wife, who received it from the Superior of the —— of Mexico City, who heard it from his confrères in Morelia.

"This city (Morelia) is the capital of Michoacan, a very rich and populous State (having more than one million inhabitants, and unequaled for agriculture and mining). It has for many years been noted for its fervent and solid piety.

"Gertrudis Sanchez, who took part in Madero's revolution, a coarse and irreligious man, ordered the expulsion of the Salesians of Don Bosco and the confiscation of their college. (I must tell you, by the way, that I am proud to have had the honor of materially aiding in the foundation of this useful establishment.)

"I forgot to tell you that this Sanchez, by the will and grace of Carranza, is now Governor of the State.

"The Salesians are greatly liked by the people, who uprose to defend them, armed with guns, clubs, stones, whatever was at hand, and so

intimidated the officials that they revoked the order, and for a few days left the poor exiles unmolested.

“But Sanchez, who had gone to Mexico City after this, and there held conference with Carranza, drinking courage at that fountain, on his return to Morelia, convoked, at night and by stealth, not only the Salesians, but the entire clergy, to whom he gave notice of expulsion, giving as a reason, of course, that they were making fanatics of the people.

“But the courageous population was ready, and several thousand men gathered in front of the Governor’s palace. (Bear in mind that the city’s population is 50,000.) All were armed as well as they could, all were prepared to fight and die, and when the Governor, trembling with rage (I do not say fear, for he is no coward), came out on the balcony and tried with fair words to calm the just riot, nothing could be heard but a shout from thousands of throats: ‘Robber! outlaw! Godless wretch! Either leave our priests in peace or we will destroy your palace!’

“I believe that the soldiers of Sanchez sympathized with the people, for he himself, soulless as he is, made no attempt at resistance. On the contrary, he underwent the humiliation of having to revoke the decree, which had been orally given. The priests were carried in triumph to their houses by their brave deliverers, who have sworn never to permit such a savage and sacrilegious treatment of their clergy.

“The Carranzista papers said not a word about this, which occurred during this very month of October (the second uprising was on the 17th); but the fact is notorious, and will serve as a lesson to many other cities just as Catholic as Morelia. And this confirms my idea that a leader who would proclaim the fullest religious liberty, such as exists in the United States, and does great honor to that noble country, would have in his favor the strongest national elements, and the result would necessarily be most favorable, for he would have established a strong, prudent and patriotic government.

“If the American people would help us in this undertaking they would permanently cement the Christian alliance of two nations, and would deserve more glory for having procured freedom for our consciences than they already have for the emancipation of the negro.

“Further commentary is unnecessary. You, honored sir, will readily understand that I am right.

“You may publish this, if you like, but please do not mention my name or residence, for my family is still in Mexico, and those in power there are capable of anything!

“When my family (I do not know when!) will be at a safe distance, there is no fact to which I will not be ready to attest, and defend in every way.”



But even far more interesting is the statement of a former Governor, himself a "Liberal." The statement was made before a notary in Texas, a copy of which is in the hands of His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate at Washington. (A certified copy is in my possession.) The Governor resigned his high office, not because he was in sympathy with Huerta, but because he objected to Huerta's methods. He left his home for the sake of his two daughters. He states emphatically that the majority of the Mexican people are law-abiding and in favor of order. He states also that: "The Catholic Church, a few Protestant churches and all the other religious creeds of Mexico have never taken any part in this revolution." Again: "In order that you may understand that I am not untruthful and that I am not partial to priests, I will state that in politics I belong to the Benito Juarez party and I was always recognized as a member of the Liberal party. I have tried to practice the greatest respect toward the Catholic religion, and I know for certain that the priests of my State, after having suffered various vexations, and this without any motive or reason, have been exiled. We have had the good fortune of never having heard any scandal on the part of any of our clergy. The same may be said of the other religious sects. I repeat that never in any revolution has Mexico witnessed such barbarous excesses as in the present uprising, and I speak as one having experience, for I witnessed two and I fought on the side of Juarez. To-day there is no respect for any of the political divisions, or any religious body in Mexico. To me any man who is honest has a right to be respected, be he Catholic, Protestant or Jew. One may think "pro" or "con" about some ideas, but about stealing and killing there must be only one opinion.

"As regards the clergy, they have no power, no chance to favor the rich people rather than the poor. Besides, the greater part of the clergy in Mexico comes from the poorer classes. Furthermore, the idea of morality and justice is prevalent in the minds of our priests."



It is charged that the Church has kept the people of Mexico in ignorance, and that ninety per cent of these people are ignorant. The answer to this is very easy.

I need only call attention to the fact that the history of the Catholic Church in Mexico may be divided into only two chapters: one, the Church under Spanish influence; the other, the Church under the Republic. The idea of giving freedom to the Church rarely occurs to the Latin governmental mind. Its idea of the separation of Church and State never admits the possibility of the Church being free within the free State. The separation laws of France clearly show what I mean. Under the pretext of separation, a plan was introduced which, if accepted, would

have utterly destroyed the Church. The Latin statesman, when hungry, wants a chance to take a bite out of the Church. Nothing else will satisfy him. Under Spanish rule the Church had often to be used as far as possible to develop Spanish power. Later the Government seized churches, religious institutions and church property. It gave back the church buildings and some of the institutions, but on condition that it could keep the property and in reparation pay for the upkeep of religion. It took that burden, therefore, away from the Church, while indirectly keeping it upon the people. It made itself the gatherer of God's share, so that it could always keep its hands on the source of supply. It dictated appointments of bishops and pastors, and said how far the Church could go in carrying out her teaching mission. Its policy was to send to the colonies the unworthy clergymen, who were not wanted abroad. Bishops had no choice but to accept them. It hampered the Church on every side, and then blamed it for the consequences it had brought upon itself. In spite of this, the Church Christianized the people. But Spanish laws were enforced which did not suit the colonies. Nothing could be done without the consent of the Spanish monarch. Education was hampered; but, in spite of this, the Church established schools. The Franciscans and other missionaries placed schools side by side with their monasteries. At first the Indians did not go to them, but after a while their opposition was overcome. In 1524 there was not a single Indian who could read. Twenty years later, when Bishop Zumarraga wanted a book translated into the Indian tongue, he mentioned the good it might do, because "there are so many who know how to read." Pedro de Gante had a thousand children under his instruction, teaching them religion, music, singing and Latin. He began a school for grown-up people and founded another for fine arts and crafts. Some of the schools had as many as from eight hundred to a thousand pupils. In spite of the difficulties, the Church did all she could, and the Government as little as possible.

When the Revolution came, and with it the Laws of Reform of Benito Juarez, an end came also to what little freedom the Church had. She was despoiled of such possessions as had been left her. She was forbidden to teach, which means to open schools of any kind, except of theology. Her ministers even could not dress as clerics. The law of May 13, 1873, forbade any religious demonstration outside of a church building, and forbade clergymen or Sisters to dress in any way that would indicate their calling. The Constitution of 1857 interfered with personal liberty to the extent of forbidding anybody to enter a religious Order, and refused religious Orders a legal right to hold property. The law of July 12, 1859, suppressed religious Orders and religious societies, forbade the foundation of new congregations, ordered all books, manuscripts,

prints and antiquities belonging to such Orders to be given up. The law of February 26 suppressed female communities. The law of July 12, 1859, took away all property from the clergy; but that of February 5, 1861, returned to the Church its parochial residences, bishops' houses, etc. Then September 25, 1873, saw a new law which forbade any religious institution to acquire property or the revenue derived from it. The law of December 14, 1874, struck at the right of the clergy to receive legacies. The law of July 31, 1859, took away from the clergy the right to manage or have anything to do with cemeteries. The law of February 2, 1861, took from the Church her hospitals and charitable institutions, as also did a law of February 28 of the same year. To make it more certain that the Church could not be charitable, the law of August 27, 1904, forbade clergymen to act as directors and administrators, or patrons of private charities, and extended this decree even to include those delegated by clergymen. It will clearly be seen that, under the Constitution and Laws of Reform, the clergy had little power left, and the Church little chance to uplift the people. A Mexican archbishop has written: "Not only was the Church despoiled of her ancient properties and oppressed by tyrannical laws, but the situation was rendered more difficult later on by the Law of Public Instruction." However, General Diaz permitted some educational foundations, seeking his authority under the Law of Private Beneficence; but under this law, even if the priests themselves wished to found a work of charity, they had to leave religion out of it. Yet, in spite of it all, some schools were founded — many, in fact — but always under the danger of information being laid against their directors and persecution following. A Mexican bishop, now in exile, told me that Mexican Catholics who desire to give religious instruction to their children have to go the length of "seeing" the secular schoolmaster, and even bribing him not to tell on them. Still, one religious Order had over four million dollars invested in schools and colleges. The Constitutionalists took it all, but left the mortgages for the Order to pay. Then they assassinated the professors of Zacatecas, destroyed the libraries, etc.



All these unjust laws are the more to be regretted when it is known that only the Church can educate or civilize the Indians. With the Indian the civil power is impotent. The Indian is religious. He may be deceived into revolution, but it must be deception that brings him into it. Carranza's troops told the Indians that they were fighting against a certain Mr. Clergyman (Don Clero), and the Indian was always looking for this tyrant, not knowing that it was the Church the Carranzistas meant. The suppression of the flourishing missions of the Jesuits and the Franciscans in the north of Mexico, at the end of the eighteenth century, resulted

either in the complete extinguishing of these Indians or their return to barbarism. Within the last few years missions among the Indians started again; but now they are destroyed. What must be said of the "patriotism" that, in a country where ninety per cent of the people are illiterate, destroys, or attempts to destroy, the only power that has shown its ability to do the work of civilization? They may advance theories by the bushel, but there is no theory regarding the work of the Church. A business man does not desert his true and tried methods of securing business. He tests his theories before he replaces the old by the new. Mexico, fifty years ago, embarked in a new venture. The result has been constant revolution, murder, destruction of property, and crimes which cry to heaven for vengeance; and now those responsible ask the world to believe that it is all done in the name of liberty, and that the Church which their forerunners reduced to impotence is responsible for it.

The revolutionists frankly directed their efforts against the rich as well as against the clergy. They demanded the forcible impoverishment of the wealthy class, without due process of law and without compensation. They have put this into force wherever they could. They have seized haciendas, forcibly entered homes and drove the owners and their families on the streets, moving in themselves. Now they insist that the clergy catered to the rich, and are, therefore, become the enemies of the poor. They forget that it is the province of the Church to aid and comfort the poor, and that the only means she has for doing it is her influence in securing the money for carrying on her work from those who have it to give. She has, therefore, always in history stood between the rich and the poor. If this were not her position, how could she establish her hospitals, schools, orphanages, and a thousand other works of charity? Even in the United States the cry goes up that the Church (by which is meant all Christian religious effort) should devote itself more to philanthropy and less to the cultivation of simple piety. In other words, the demand is being made that the Church more than ever must devote herself to securing from the rich the means to alleviate suffering. How could religion answer that demand if its enemies charge that it caters to the rich when it begs from them? In Mexico the Constitutionalists not only kill the Church because they say she does no good, but, on the other hand, they kill her when she does do good.



During the Spanish régime in Mexico the Church maintained as friendly a relation with the State as was possible. If she had not maintained such relations her voice would never have been heard in court. It was the influence of the Church that secured a hearing for Las Casas against the oppressors of the Indians. To-day in Mexico the Church has

no influence. A new Las Casas could accomplish nothing; but the Church has had some influence with property-holders, which was always used to favor the poor. The only mitigation of the hard lot of some of the peons was won by the influence of the Church over individuals.

The Constitutionalists insist that the people of Mexico are against the Church; yet, when the churches are opened, they are crowded. In more than one case the persecutors had to stop their fury in fear of an uprising among the people, who crowded around the exiled priests until the leaders were terrified. But the same leaders took good care in the next place that the people could not menace them, for they took away their weapons.

The Zapata revolution is a case in point. Zapata has held two States in a grip of iron. His revolution is popular. His soldiers are the only ones who show a disposition to work. They have taken up land and they are cultivating it. A short time ago I met a prominent gentleman, Mexican, who had gone through the entire length of Zapata's territory in carriage and on horseback. He scarcely saw a soldier. People were working in their fields. The Church in Zapata's territory has not been molested. Churches are open, and one of the bishops, at this writing, is actually out on his confirmation tour. If the Revolution is a popular uprising against the Church, why is it that Zapata holds his power through the popularity of his movement with the people, though he has made no attack whatever upon the Church and religion? Some excesses have been committed by Zapatists, it is true, but by the camp-followers. None of the exiles I met have charged Zapata with responsibility for them. On the contrary, they warmly defended him, and stated that when outrages have been committed neither Zapata himself nor the general run of his people had any responsibility for them. On the other hand, outrages by Constitutionalists had been fomented by the most abominable calumnies, and by the leaders themselves. They manufactured plots out of whole cloth. "Conspiracies by the clergy," never even thought of before the troops entered, were announced even before the Constitutionalists had had time to make an investigation.

The cry in this revolution has been a cry for vengeance against the assassins of Madero. Carranza himself makes this his rallying cry, forgetting that he himself was against Madero and intended leading a revolution against him. The opportunity which arose through Madero's death did not change his mind about a revolution, but changed the details. Now he charges the clergy with having coöperated in the assassination of Madero. His proof is that the clergy recognized Madero's government. How much truth is there in this statement?

The revolution which ended in the assassination of Madero lasted ten days. It came on suddenly and without warning. These days are called

the "Ten Tragic Days." The outbreak occurred in the City of Mexico, and was practically confined to that city. If the clergy were in league to bring about the downfall of Madero, it might be expected that the revolution would have been general. What time did the clergy have to compass their ends in ten days, and what object could they have had for bringing about the downfall of *the first government in fifty years which permitted free elections*, by means of which the Catholic party, it is conceded, would have been placed in power? The downfall of Madero was a blow to the interests of religion. It is perfectly true that the bishops and clergy recognized the government of Huerta. What else could they do? He had been placed in power according to the laws and Constitution of Mexico. He had been recognized by the Congress, the Senate, the Supreme Court and the diplomatic corps, including the American Minister. The Church stands for lawful authority. When that authority is in power it is the duty of the Church to accept it and live under it. This is exactly what was done. It is not the business of the Church to foment revolution. The clergy had no right to put Huerta on trial. Neither the laws of Mexico nor their own obligation as priests assigned to them any such duty. The Church wanted peace, and accepted Huerta as she had accepted Madero. Had she done otherwise, there might have been a lawful charge against her of fostering rebellion; but against the Church the charges will be made anyhow. The hatreds of man for man are unaccountable enough, but there is a still more unaccountable hatred of man for God, and all that represents Him.



I have seen a document issued by the Constitutional representative in New York City, attempting to prove that the Church was playing politics. The letter is dated July 11, 1913. It is from Archbishop Mora of Mexico City to Señor Urrutia. The Archbishop said: "I beg to assure you once more that all the curates and priests under my jurisdiction, in compliance with their duty, will make every effort, in order to bring about, as soon as possible, the fulfillment of the aspirations of all the good people in this Republic, who desire the peace and tranquillity of the beloved country. I say that they do so in compliance with their duty; because the Church desires peace and to avoid bloodshed, and that all coöperate to the ultimate object of society, which is the well-being of all its members." Is there anything in these words that indicates more than a desire to work under the existing form of government, with an object of bringing peace to the country? This is the evidence put forth by the representatives of the Constitutionalists themselves to justify murder, exile, imprisonment and unspeakable outrages against the innocent. What decent court could accept such evidence? Did even

Robespierre send a single person to the guillotine on such testimony? If he did, who wants to be classed with Robespierre?

Truth is that the Constitutionalists have gone forward without even a probability of evidence. They have gone forward in the face of a pastoral letter, issued by a number of bishops in the City of Mexico, protesting vigorously, while Huerta was still in power, that neither the Church nor the clergy had mixed up in revolution or in political matters. As one Mexican archbishop said to me: "These men have adopted the cry of Voltaire, 'Fling mud; some of it will stick.'" They fling the mud in such generous quantities that some of it is bound to stick; even in the face of the fact that Huerta himself, whom the Church was supposed to uphold, gave out a law of oppression concerning ecclesiastical property, and suppressed Catholic newspapers, among them *La Nacion*, the organ of the Catholic party, simply because this party refused him votes. He exiled its president and persecuted its members; yet they charge that he was the candidate of the Catholics themselves.

## VII.

### OUTSIDE INFLUENCES AGAINST THE CHURCH IN MEXICO.

The assertion that the recent revolution in Mexico was financed and the revolutionists armed by capitalists in the United States, one meets constantly and hears on every side. I have never heard it denied, even in our own country. Americans do not take the trouble to deny what they believe to be true. With that situation I have nothing at all to do. As a citizen of the United States I deeply regret it, but my present discussion concerns chiefly the outrages against religion.

The charge that the Government of the United States directly aided and abetted the revolutionists I do not entirely believe. I have too high a regard for President Wilson to concede anything of the kind. I do believe that he was mistaken; but I also believe that, for the mistake, biased information and biased investigators were mainly responsible. I believe that men sent by the President to report facts as they found them reported visionary dreams of things as they wanted them. I believe it, too, on the testimony of honorable men, who had more opportunity of knowing the actual condition of things in Mexico than these strangers, some of whom could not even speak the language of the country, but who allowed their own bigotry to taint their judgment. Señor Frisbie, an American and the son of General Frisbie, who spent nearly all of his life in Mexico, informed me that, on a Ward Line boat for New York, he met the wife of one of these representatives, who was himself on the boat, returning to report to the President, and that this lady said to him, not knowing that he was a Catholic, that "the priests and nuns should be driven out of Mexico." Another of these representatives made similar statements in Vera Cruz to a gentleman whose letter I have in my possession. But all that is neither here nor there. It concerns the political situation, which, so far as this book is concerned, is no affair of mine.

Two outside influences were exerted, and have been exerted for years, to the injury of the Catholic Church in Mexico. One of these is the influence of secret societies and the other the influence of a section of American Protestantism.



Concerning the influence of the first, the following editorial, taken from the *New York Times* of November 8, 1914, will be enlightening:

"The reappearance as a threatening factor in Mexican politics of Scottish Rite Masonry is a phenomenon which merits a word of present

comment. In 1824, with the very beginning of modern Mexico, the two principal political factions were allied either with the Scottish or York Rites of Masonry. The Scottish Rite had grown up under Spanish influence and was all-powerful until our first diplomatic representative in the young republic, Joel Poinsett of South Carolina, remembered now chiefly as the botanist who gave his name to the poinsetta, founded the York Rite purely as a political factor. The lodges of the Yorkinos, who were much less exclusive than the Escoseses, multiplied rapidly and exerted all the influence of the various branches of an American political machine. Of course, Poinsett was not authorized by our Government to meddle in Mexican politics or to extend the influence of Masonry in Mexico, and his imprudence eventually led to his recall. But for many years Masonry exerted a strong factional force throughout the country, and the sudden reappearance of the Scottish Rite, in a pronunciamiento against the United States Government for not withdrawing the troops from Vera Cruz without conditions, suggests that Masonry may have been exerting its influence quietly in the upheavals of the last four years.

"Of course, the historic Masonry of Mexico took on its political purpose accidentally. The order of Scotch Masons was largely composed of men of Spanish blood, the aristocracy of the country which had thrown off the foreign yoke, put its first Emperor to death, and asserted itself as a self-governed community. They worked together for protection. But Poinsett's York Grand Lodge was founded deliberately with political intent and inevitably lent fresh political strength to the older lodge. The survival or the revival of Masonry as a force in politics in Mexico is interesting, and may be important. The report that all the signers of the inflammatory document have been put in jail indicates that the authorities in Mexico City do not view favorably the intrusion of secret societies in politics."



I do not, in publishing the above editorial, desire to make charges against the rank and file of the membership of the American Masonic body. I am not unaware of the fact that Masonry in the United States is considered by the great majority of its members as nothing more than a fraternal or social organization; but Masons themselves in America have recognized the fact that the Masonic body all over the world does not hold the same ideals. It will be remembered that some years ago, a protest was made by a Masonic body in Canada to the English Grand Master (at that time the Prince of Wales, who afterward became King Edward VII.) against the establishment in Montreal of lodges operating under a charter from the Grand Orient of France. Their objection was based upon the fact that such lodges were anti-Christian, while Masonry under

British jurisdiction held belief in God to be a fundamental condition for membership. Their protest was ineffectual, for the foreign lodges were established, and, as a matter of fact, exist to-day. It will also be remembered that only three or four years ago, when Montreal was preparing for the great Eucharistic Congress, which would bring to the city Catholic prelates, priests and laymen from all over the world, and was, as a matter of fact, the largest convention the city was ever called upon to handle, it was discovered that one of these foreign lodges deliberately planned to direct visiting priests to houses of ill-fame instead of to respectable boarding-houses, and afterward to have the places raided, so as to make it appear that priests had chosen such residences during their stay at Montreal. The exposure of the whole plot was made in the public press of Montreal. If proof is needed that American Masons know that universal Masonry is something entirely different from their own ideals, it is found in the acknowledgment of the British and American lodges themselves, whose members claim openly that they have no affiliation with what we might call Latin Masonry, which includes the Masonry of Mexico and South America. I have talked with hundreds of American Masons, and every one has the same statement to make, that Latin Masons would not be received in American lodges. However, this statement is not entirely true, though those who make it believe that it is. Even Latin Masonry is divided. In Italy, where Latin Masonry is strong, the division exists; and the point of difference is the question of political activity and infidelity. As an illustration, it may be remembered that when Mr. Theodore Roosevelt visited Rome he received representatives of one body of Italian Masons, headed by Baron Fava, as brothers. Representatives of the other had no such recognition. Now, no one for an instant dreams that Theodore Roosevelt, Mason, would affiliate himself with men who aim at the destruction of order and who deny the existence of God, any more than any one would believe that William H. Taft, Mason, could do the same thing. There are numberless American Masons who have not only been most friendly with their Catholic fellow-citizens, but are even sincere admirers of the Catholic Church. No one believes that these men have any desire to see her influence destroyed, her charities broken up, and her children left without religious direction of any kind. We may safely absolve the great body of American Masons from the charge of knowingly injuring the Church in Mexico.

Nevertheless, it is true that, from the great body of American Masons, some men have been selected who are in sympathy with the irreligious propaganda of Latin Masonry; and there is every reason to believe that, through these men, Masonic influence has wrought injury to religion in Mexico. How far this has gone no one can tell, but that representatives

of the United States have fraternized with the Masons in Mexico is openly charged by the Mexicans themselves. I have a letter from which this remarkable statement is taken: "When the Masons in Mexico called on United States Masons to get us out of Vera Cruz, I knew," etc.



What evidence my informant had I do not know. Having been in Vera Cruz practically from the beginning of American occupation, he was in a position to learn things that I could not possibly have learned. The point I desire to make is, that American Masons, viewing their society purely as a fraternal and social organization, can scarcely blame the Church for objecting when all we know of Masonry, outside of British and American possessions, is that the fraternity stands before the people as religion's unqualified and unrelenting enemy, through whose influence murders, robberies, exilings and worse have been perpetrated, not only in Mexico, but also in Portugal. It is a recognized fact in both Italy and France that Masonry stands for irreligion and the total destruction of the Catholic Church.

In Mexico, though Porfirio Diaz was himself a Mason, yet during his dictatorship the lodges were greatly reduced in membership. When Madero came into power there was a campaign for active reorganization. This campaign sought recruits not only among the middle class, but also among the workingmen. Before the revolution entered cities, the lodges fiercely attacked the Catholic religion, through calumnies from press and platform. Their members served as spies and informers, and even exposed the hiding-places of the priests and of the sacred vessels. This is not a guess. It is an admitted fact all over Mexico.

*El Liberal*, the official organ of Carranza, can be quoted as an authority upon this point.

It charges that the Church in Mexico wants American intervention, in spite of the fact that two archbishops have issued letters as patriotic as any statements ever given out in Mexico, and in spite of the fact that not one of the churchmen who are refugees here would even consider the idea of upholding intervention. The Mexican bishops and priests are Mexicans and patriotic men.

"It is indispensable," says *El Liberal*, "that to accomplish our determination a strong call be made to the followers of truth to come to the line to fight for victory or death, for liberty and fraternity in the temples consecrated by triumphs and inexplicable abnegations — the lodges. . . . We Mexican lovers of liberty, equality and fraternity, let us hasten to join the army of the defense of these ideals. Let us work in our lodges toward its realization."

When I charge that a section of American Protestantism has played an evil part in the Mexican persecution, I do not intend to charge my Protestant fellow-citizens in general with the crime. There are some thirty million people in the United States who have allied themselves in some way with Protestantism. Most of these meet their Catholic fellow-citizens socially and in a business way every day. They live at peace with them, and they ask for nothing better than that this condition continue. They are willing to grant to others the liberty of conscience which they desire for themselves. They know their Catholic fellow-citizens. They have confidence in them. Many of their families are allied with Catholic families by marriage or ties of blood. They contribute to Catholic charities, and often generously at that. They believe the Catholic Church has a mission in the United States, and they look upon the Church as having given a notable contribution to the peace and prosperity of this Republic. In American wars they have fought side by side with Catholic soldiers, as to-day they work side by side with Catholic men and women in the daily duties of life. It is far from my thought to charge such men and women with complicity in the outrages perpetrated in Mexico.

Still there is another section, representing the uneducated and bigoted sectarians among Protestants. Nothing less than the total destruction of the Catholic Church in America would satisfy them, and to bring about such a result they would not hesitate at all to revive the iniquities of past ages, when religion was so bound up with the politics of nations that in her name thousands were sent to their death. This section has many papers and magazines devoted to the cause of religious enmity. One of these papers has a circulation of a million and a half. Decent Protestants have protested against this situation. They have been horrified at the vile calumnies these organs of bigotry fling at the Church and her priesthood. Their protest has been voiced time and again by such men as Dr. Washington Gladden. The secular papers will not print their tirades, but still they go on with their work. They scatter their infamous libels. They call the Pope "the Chief of White Slavers." They brand priests as monsters of iniquity. They declare our religious houses to be dens of prostitution. They put the mark of shame upon pure and virtuous Catholic womanhood, a mark which the worst libertine is willing to declare, from his own experience, to be notoriously undeserved. The papers printing such libels freely circulate through our mails at second-class rates. Consequently they are virtually subsidized by the Government and Catholics themselves are taxed to uphold them. The Dominion of Canada has refused permission to circulate such papers through its post-offices, or even through other carriers. We permit it all in the name of a free press; but it is not liberty of the press that we are granting, but the beginning of unbridled license.



The vile calumnies of these people have been circulated in Mexico. Their lurid tales have been printed in Spanish, with the intention of swaying Mexican Catholics from their allegiance to the Church. They have preached in Mexico through Protestant missionaries that the United States is a Protestant nation, but Protestant in their own sense; so that whatever is done against the Catholic Church surely meets with approval. A court of the Guardians of Liberty, the bigoted society which has General Miles for its leader, sent to Villa the following letter:

“ Alamo Court, No. 1, Guardians of Liberty of Texas, a patriotic organization of American citizens, with courts throughout the entire United States, which has for its purpose the maintaining of the United States Constitution and the complete separation of Church and State, desires to express to you, and other patriotic Mexicans, our hearty approval of your actions and the great good and service you have and are rendering your people and the country.

“ We would especially commend your actions in ridding your country of the basest of human vultures, the Catholic priesthood. Whenever women are forced to secretly confess to a man who has never married, and knows nothing of the sacredness of woman or of home, it is but natural for immorality to exist, and until this practice is stopped it is impossible to raise up a liberty-loving, intelligent, patriotic, moral generation.

“ Again assuring you of our appreciation of your invaluable worth to your country, and trusting that you may continue your good work until the people of your country are freed, indeed, from the root of the trouble, the Roman Catholic Church, in the language of the patriot, we would exclaim, ‘ Viva Mexico by Villa ! ’



This was openly offering the encouragement which we very well knew had been for a long time extended secretly. All of these things are done in the name of American Protestantism, and done in such a way as to make American Protestants responsible for them. Protestant missions in Mexico have their share of the blame for the persecutions. For years they have been working, but their achievements have been practically nil. By this time people ought to know from experience that the Latin is a Catholic or nothing. When he loses his allegiance to the Church he becomes an infidel or an atheist. Such a being as an indifferentist can hardly find room to breathe among Latin people. The Latin must be one thing or the other. Those who are swayed from the Catholic Faith by Protestant missionary efforts land in the ranks of open infidelity, enemies to all religion. What triumph is it for Protestantism

that France persecuted the Catholic Church, when Viviani declared that his task was to "blot out the stars from heaven"? What triumph did Protestantism gain from the new birth of atheism in Portugal? If Protestants believe that the Catholic Church is Christian at all, why do they follow a plan which they know will destroy Christianity with the Church? Can any one answer these questions? To me they are mysteries beyond solution. In Mexico former Protestant ministers are to-day "generals, colonels and captains." The Provisional President, Guiterrez, is said to be an ex-Protestant minister. The revolutionary governors of two states were Protestant ministers. Almost to a man have these former salaried officials of American Protestant missionary societies entered the ranks of revolutionists.

## VIII.

### A LAST WORD.

This story I have written down as I received it from the mouths of eye-witnesses. I am well aware of the fact that due allowance must be made for natural resentment in those who were the victims of injustice toward their persecutors. I have no objection to the reader making his own allowance in this regard, and making the allowance as generously as he pleases. There still remain the great facts of the case: the murder, exile, imprisonment, rape and robbery of the innocent. Nations often have in history been built on a foundation of crime, but we all had hope that the enlightened twentieth century would have nothing to add to the evil record. In making your allowances will the reader please weigh these, some findings of my own, to the evidence?

*First.* In all my conversations with the refugees, lay and clerical, I met but few who were not enlightened men and women, many highly educated, all sober and serious, some speaking many languages, most of them graduates of colleges and universities — in short, the kind of people the average American citizen likes to know, and feels honored in knowing.

*Second.* Among these refugees I found but one who disliked Mexico and would not return there under any circumstance. In justice to him, however, I must state that he was not a Mexican citizen, and that he had private reasons of his own for the dislike, reasons which any red-blooded man would justify sentimentally, if not logically. All the others loved Mexico and wanted nothing better than the opportunity to return to their native land. They desire peace and the reign of law. Their passionate attachment to their country might well be envied by our more matter-of-fact sort of patriotism.

*Third.* Not one Mexican with whom I conversed desired the intervention of the United States, if such intervention meant the loss to his country of her independence. The utmost limit of their concession to the necessity of intervention was for that kind of intervention which would guarantee beforehand the integrity of their nation, and her freedom as soon as peace was restored and a just and stable government set up. They all believed that the United States could well be a sister, but never a successful stepmother to Mexico.

*Fourth.* I found that every one of these refugees had lost all suspicion of American motives, even though condemning what they consid-

ered our "mistakes" in dealing with Mexican problems. They had learned that our motives, that is, the motives of the great mass of the American people, were good.

*Fifth.* The charitable and fraternal action of American Catholics deeply touched the refugees, and, learning of the liberty of conscience enjoyed in this Republic, their admiration increased with their gratitude. I could not help thinking that this argues more for the prosperity of future trade relations than the cruel policy of concession-grabbers, whose money and influence have deluged Mexico with innocent blood. A foundation is now laid for a brotherly feeling between Americans and Mexicans. Love will build up what cupidity has destroyed.



On these things, as well as on the facts before presented, let me base my last word about Mexico to my fellow-citizens, Protestant and Catholic.

There is need in the world to-day of an enlightened nation, honoring God, loving peace and presenting ideals of true liberty, whose very existence will be a rebuke to lawlessness, and whose greatest message is the old message of faith, hope and charity. There is need in this Western world of a great nation, whose glory is not in conquest by arms, or even conquest in commerce, but rather in a spirit of justice and fraternity which permeates all its people. We all think that the United States comes nearer both ideals than any nation yet born to the earth; but, alas! her sister nations on this Western hemisphere look at her with suspicion not unmixed with fear. To them she is "The Colossus of the North," whose sons come only to extort riches, while scorning their people, berating their convictions, mocking their religion, and often fomenting bloody discords. Have we any idea how deeply many of our fellow-citizens have gone in encouraging and paying for the frequent revolutions of which we speak so often with such contempt?

We, who love to think that we regard the rights of conscience above all other rights, do we reflect on the fact that, in our name and to the flaunting of our flag, we send to the neighbors whose good will we desire to cultivate, men who tell them that their ideals of centuries must be abandoned, that their methods of worshiping God are idolatrous, that their own sons in the clergy are moral lepers, that their own daughters who have adopted the religious state are dupes and prostitutes, that their shrines are abominations, that their love for God is a sham?

Do we ever reflect that Spanish civilization has had a more difficult task than "Anglo-Saxon" civilization in the Americas, in that it was "handicapped" by the inexorable Faith which forced the conqueror to *preserve* and not *destroy* the conquered, and, thus limited, could not *colonize* one-tenth as much as attempt to *civilize*? Do we give the

Spanish conqueror of Indian nations credit for the fact that, when he brought his Church with him he was hampering the exercise of his own power, by religion's demand to give the Indian the right to live? Does he not sometimes stop to think what would be the condition even of these United States had the conquerors here preserved the Indian to the extent of outnumbering the whites ten to one? Could we expect anything better, under such conditions, than Mexico has, and some other Spanish republics have, to-day?



Let us be fair. Spain *preserved* where we *destroyed*. With a constantly diminishing Indian population, wards of the State, having schools and colleges for all who wish to enter them, what one of our Indians has ever shown the governmental and military genius of a Diaz, the intelligent bravery of a Mejia, the surgical ability of a Urrutia, the philosophical knowledge of a Munguia, the science of a Carrillo y Azcona, the theological training of an Alarcon, the poetic fire of an Altamirano, the political acumen of an Estagnol, the legal and journalistic career of Sanchez Santos, the artistic talents of Panduro and Velazquez? Indians? Yes, all Indians, pure-blooded Indians. Name those of ours whose genius has made such marks on the history of our country. Sitting Bull? Geronimo? Alas! such a beginning speaks badly for an ending. Think this over before you condemn Spanish civilization in the Americas. We have little to show for one hundred years of "Anglo-Saxon" attempts to uplift our Indians. Yet the Indians of Mexico have produced men of letters, artists, statesmen, soldiers, scientists, learned bishops and priests—men of genius. But for all of that Spain's government was not responsible. The credit belongs to the maligned Church, which stood out, with Fray Las Casas, Fray Martin of Valencia, and Bishop Juan de Zumarraga, for the rights of the natives, and sacrificed their entire lives for their conversion, civilization and protection. What if there still remain some of the ancient superstitions? Have we, the enlightened, gotten rid entirely of ours? What of the Wall street broker who still trusts the clairvoyant before his brains, who will not fling his hat on a hotel bed because the action is supposed to be unlucky? What of the thirteen-at-table nonsense, or the fear of beginning a work on Friday? The missionaries of Mexico did not transplant *Spaniards* to Mexican soil to grow a garden without seeding and to dispossess the wild beauty already there. They seeded the ground anew, and grafted religion and civilization to plants their colonies already had. Thus they worked to gradually clear off the ancient superstitions. We tried to burn off our Indians' superstitions, and our Indians went fast with them. We transplanted England and Ireland, Scotland and Germany here; but the Indians who yet live have still their

superstitions. They are dying, in many cases, with them. It's a different story, that of Mexico and that of our country; but, for the ancient people of both, those of Mexico have the greater reason for gratitude.

When Sir Lionel Carden, the British Ambassador to Mexico under Huerta, left this country for England, he expressed sympathy for the "decent people" of Mexico. Do we even think of these "decent people" when we give our unqualified sympathy to hordes of bandits, whose past records alone would be *prima facie* presumption of guilt in any court of justice in our country? Are "liberators" made of such material? For two generations have the old colleges and universities of Mexico been closed and new ones substituted; yet to-day we find Mexico's best people sending their children, almost by stealth, to the few religious schools that have stolen back, and, when that is not possible, to schools of the same kind in Spain and the United States. Francisco Madero himself was a pupil of Mt. St. Mary's College in Maryland; Carranza a constant and friendly visitor to the College of the Jesuits in Saltillo. The man in whom both our Government and our people placed its highest hopes for peace in Mexico was the Christian De la Barra; and next to him the Christian convert, Gamboa.



Susan Hale, in her history of Mexico, says: "It is evident that what is needed is good government, good religion and good education." But we have, alas! by our own greed and our prejudice, made government a thing to be fought for by robbers; of religion a thing to be held up to scorn and insult; of the old schools, that once were glorious, barracks and ruins. We listen and applaud when the "liberals" of every camp tell us that the Church is responsible for poverty, ignorance and lawlessness; but we do not listen to the Church which gave to Mexico all the civilization she possesses, when she makes this gentle plaint, over the noise of murder, debauchery and lust: You blame me for poverty, yet you took from me the endowments for my hospitals, my orphanages, my countless works of mercy. You blame me for ignorance, when you closed my schools, stole my colleges and suppressed my universities which first lit the torch of learning among this people. You say I have added nothing to science and art, but you destroyed the art I brought with me, burned my books and scattered the results of my labor for science to the four winds of heaven. You blame me for ignorance after forbidding me for fifty years to teach. You blame me for lawlessness, when you destroyed my missions among a peaceful and thriving Indian population, and gave, in my place to the people, the thirty pieces of silver with which you bribed them to murder their fellows. You took the cross out of their hands to replace it with a torch and a gun. Show me one good thing in

Mexico I did not give you. Show me one genius for whom I was not responsible. Show me one step in advance I did not help you to take. Cut away from your country all that I put in it, and see what remains. You may thrust me out, exile my bishops, murder my priests, again steal my schools, desecrate my sanctuaries and my virgins, but you can not blot out history, you can not erase the mark I have left on you — not in a century of centuries.

If the United States is to be the friend and sister of Mexico, to the advantage of both, our citizens must rid themselves of a multitude of inherited prejudices, and substitute a spirit of understanding for a spirit of greed. There is more to be had in Mexico than oil and mining concessions: there is the good will that makes such concessions a logical consequence of a desire for help and a manifestation of deep gratitude. I have no wish to condemn business enterprise, but it is poor business that depends for success on machine guns. If powder and ball are the things we want to dispose of to Mexico, the question arises: which country is the less civilized, the one that sells or the one that buys? We scorn to learn the language of Mexico, yet we expect to talk to her people so that they will understand. Pardon me, but *do* they understand when we talk from the black mouths of cannon?

Mexicans do need "good government," and we have the opportunity now of giving it to them, not by imposing our views upon them, not by taking away their independence, but by telling them fairly and honestly that we will help no government set up by thieves, nor any government that is not founded on the principles of equal justice to all. Mexico can not get along without a big brother yet; but a big brother who lets his little brother fall into a well to drown is a poor excuse for a brother at all.

Yes, Mexico needs "good religion." She has the Mother Church of Christendom in her midst, but chained and bound by laws that were intended to kill her. But Mexico's history shows that she will accept no other religion. American Protestantism has tried for fifty years to supplant the Catholic Church, but has not succeeded in doing any more than the work of enlarging the number of atheists and indifferentists. These missions are making no friends for us, but rather causing resentment against us. Their very presence is taken as an insult by the enlightened people, who can not but think that we regard them as heathen. Unbind the Church of their Fathers, the Church of Las Casas; give her again the right to teach and to preach; let her build her missions anew with a guarantee that they shall stand, not as relics of past greatness, but as living, acting agencies for the uplift of the Indians and their advance to greater things.

Yes, Mexico needs "good education." Then make every educational work free, under democratic and wise laws. See that the teacher is not penalized, his work destroyed, and his endowments seized by rapacious banditti. Give help to every effort for the instruction of the masses. Follow Washington's advice to encourage the means of education. It works well with us; why should it be disregarded in Mexico? Would we in these United States think of confiscating the hundreds of millions of dollars invested in private educational endowments for the universities of Harvard or Yale or Chicago or Princeton, because they are private and not state institutions; would we think of killing off the endowments of human devotion and self-sacrifice of Washington, Georgetown and Notre Dame, because they are religious institutions? Then why give approval, by a pleased look or a smirking silence, when these same things are done in Mexico by bandits with American weapons in their hands?



Mexico lies prostrate to-day. Anarchy reigns. Religion is over half destroyed. Greed steals the very school books from the children. Capital is fleeing. Labor gladly grasps a gun, and works at killing for pay. Virgins put on mourning for the worse than death that has befallen them. The country lifts her head to look at us with eyes that are more than half reproachful, but, thank God, there is also hope in them. We have our opportunity, one that, taken now at the flood, leads on to better than fortune. All South America, the South America we want to win to our side, the South America we need, is watching us, to see if our good offices must be bought by gold, by the sacrifice of hallowed and holy traditions. This hour is the hour full of fate for us. Shall we grasp the full measure of its pregnant possibilities?

# The Speech of the Silent Man

A REPLY TO MR. JOHN LIND

When a silent man puts his thoughts into language, the world expects something. When that silent man happens to have been the Governor of a State and the trusted personal representative of the ruler of what we believe to be the greatest nation on earth, we expect something of tremendous importance. When that silent man, who had been a Governor, etc., has a wise face to match his silence, as becometh a University Regent, we expect, when he speaks, to shed new light on any question, of sufficient "pith and moment" to wring speech out of him.

In all these things has Mr. John Lind disappointed us. The public has been devoured with curiosity regarding his report to the President on the Mexican crisis. Attempts have been made, even in Congress, to find out what the report contained; but the attempts failed. Mr. Lind has been importuned to speak, but he has spoken only on private occasions, or at semi-private banquets with all reporters barred. But at last Mr. Lind has given his views to the world. He has taken his time about it, presumably so that it might be understood they were the result of deep study and thought. Months and months have elapsed since he returned from Mexico, and only now (December, 1914) has he made his views public. In *The Bellman* of December 5, and again in the same magazine of December 12, Mr. Lind tells what he thinks of Mexico and her people. I have read the articles, and after reading them have put them down with anything but a feeling of satisfaction. It would have been better for Mr. Lind to have maintained his dignified silence. "The mountain was in labor and produced a mouse." No, that is not exactly the case. The mouse was produced all right; but the mountain was only a mole hill, and the mole hill itself is now nothing more than a mirage.

Mr. Lind's article quite naturally divides itself into two parts: one dealing with the historic side, and the other giving what might be called the personal side, because it gives Mr. Lind's own personal opinions upon the situation. I am going to take up both sides separately.

## THE HISTORICAL SIDE.

The historical part of Mr. Lind's article is absolutely worthless; first, because it is not Mr. Lind's at all, and, secondly, because it is not true. Most of it is taken, with only a half attempt at paraphrasing, from an article written by E. B. Tylor, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., for the *Encyclopedia*

Britannica, and which was published in the ninth edition, A. D. 1888, Volume 16, pp. 210 to 213. Of course, there is absolutely no reason why Mr. Lind should not have consulted an Encyclopedia to verify his original research, or his own studies; but it is absolutely puerile for a man who avowedly poses as an authority on Mexico, after having spent months in that country on one of the most important missions within the gift of the American Government, to take practically all his facts from an Encyclopedia, and even, in many cases, borrow the very language of the book itself. Any schoolboy can copy an article from an Encyclopedia; but if he attempted to hand in such an article, even paraphrased, to an examining board, his youth could scarcely save him from censure. Mr. Lind is no youth. He is no schoolboy, but he evidently has lost none of the schoolboy tricks. I select a few lines from Dr. Tylor and a few lines from Mr. Lind, to show the deadly parallel:

## MR. LIND:

"Below the king was a numerous and powerful class of nobles."

"A rich and powerful merchant class."

"Great estates were owned by the crown."

"Slavery existed, but in a rather mild form. The children of slaves were born free."

"There was a Supreme Court for the cognizance of law appeals, located in the palace, in the city of Mexico. There were inferior tribunals in the principal cities, over each of which a Supreme Judge presided. These judges held office for life, and could not be removed even by the king. Their decisions in criminal cases were final. Lands were set apart for the maintenance of these judicial officers. They appointed and supervised the actions of the subordinate magistrates, and revised their judgments. In fact, nothing gives a higher idea of the elaborate civilization of Mexico than this judicial system, which culminated in a general court presided over by the king."

"The laws and records of the court were set down in picture-writing."

"The criminal code was very severe. Fraud, the removal of landmarks, and adultery, were punished by having the offender's head crushed between two stones, or cutting out the heart."

## DR. TYLOR:

"Below the king was a numerous and powerful class of nobles."

"A rich and powerful merchant class."

"The greatest estates belonged to the king."

"Other classes of slaves were mildly treated, and their children were born free."

"The Supreme Courts of law formed part of the palace, and there were tribunals in the principal cities, over each of which presided a Supreme Judge, who was irremovable and whose criminal decisions not even the king might reverse. He appointed the lower judges and heard appeals from them. Lands were set apart for the maintenance of judges, and, indeed, nothing gives a higher idea of the elaborate civilization of Mexico than this judicial system, which culminated in the general court and council of state, presided over by the king."

"The laws and records of suits were set down in picture-writing."

"The criminal laws were of extreme severity. Fraud, removing landmarks, adultery, etc., which differed as to whether the criminal had his heart cut out on the altar, his head crushed between two stones, etc."

The above are only a few selections. I could go on and make as many more; but any reader who desires to see the deadly parallel for himself,

need only read over the historical part of Mr. Lind's article and then Dr. Tylor's paper in the Britannica. How much of an authority Mr. John Lind is on the history of Mexico can now be judged very fairly.

It is bad enough to engage in literary piracy, but to steal what is untrue is many times worse, and unforgivably stupid. Stealing diamonds is bad, but stealing paste diamonds, not knowing that they are paste, must be very unsatisfactory to the thief. That is about the position Mr. Lind is in. Dr. Edward B. Tylor was an Englishman, born in 1832. In 1856, or when he was twenty-four years of age, he went to Cuba, and, having met an ethnologist there, he proceeded to Mexico with him. He became interested in Mexico through that visit, and wrote a book, which he published in 1861. I take this information about Dr. Tylor from the Britannica's latest edition. I merely wish the reader to know that Dr. Tylor was only twenty-four years of age when he went to Mexico, and that he lived at a period when he would naturally be influenced by the man who was, at that time, considered the great authority on Spanish-America — Prescott. Since Dr. Tylor's time Mr. Prescott's history, a great part of it, has been relegated by scientific men to where it belongs, to the shelves of delightful romance. Mr. Prescott used the stories of the Spanish conquerors of Mexico, their reports back to the court of Spain, for all they were worth. As romances they were worth a great deal, but as facts they were worth very little. It was Cortez' business to make the Spanish monarchs believe in the wonders of his conquest; and the glowing imagination of some of the people with him helped to do the rest.



Two men have thrown utter discredit upon Prescott's "history" — A. F. Bandelier and Charles F. Lummis. Bandelier devoted his work to the Indians of our own Southwest, Mexico and South America. According to the Britannica, Bandelier made himself "the leading authority on the history of Arizona and New Mexico," and, "with F. H. Cushing and his successors, one of the leading authorities on prehistoric civilization." "Bandelier has shown the falsity of various historical myths, notably his conclusions respecting the Inca civilization of Peru." Mr. Bandelier, in a preface to Charles F. Lummis' "Spanish Pioneers," stands behind every word that Lummis writes, and Lummis himself has utterly destroyed the romances of Prescott. "That we have not given justice to the Spanish pioneers," says Mr. Bandelier, "is simply because we have been misled. They made a record unparalleled, but our text-books have not recognized that fact, though they no longer dispute it. Now, thanks to the new school of American history, we are coming to the truth, a truth which every manly American will be glad to know. I can only say that the estimates

and statements embodied in this volume are strictly true; and that I hold myself ready to defend them from the standpoint of historical science."

The whole historic section of Mr. Lind's article, following Dr. Tylor's lead, is really an attempt to show how little the Spaniards did and how much of a better civilization they destroyed.

The books of Mr. Lummis on the "Spanish Pioneers" and on "The Awakening of a Nation" (Mexico) are eye-openers to those who desire to know the truth regarding the old civilization and the new. "In spite of our reasonable hostility to the Spanish blood," he says, "we must not give our eyes the lie." "To such as find the testimony of Humboldt inefficient," says Mr. Lummis, "there could be no more useful reading than the laws of Spain as to the Aborigines—the highest-minded, most complete and most noble 'Indian policy' ever framed by man." As an example of the romance in the statements which now pass as history concerning Mexico, both Lummis and Bandelier proved, from fifteen to twenty years ago, that the famous "columns of porphyry and jasper supporting marble balconies," which Dr. Tylor concedes "were piers carrying slabs," to be nothing more than adobe houses like the houses used by our own Pueblo Indians.



But even Prescott did not swallow all the yarns of the Spanish conquerors; but those that he did accept have, nine-tenths of them, gone to the scrap heap. What folly it is at its best, the idea that a people could have been highly civilized who resorted to frightful human sacrifices! Eighty thousand prisoners of war were sacrificed by Montezuma at the dedication of one great temple, "until the gutters ran red with blood."

But Mr. Lind thinks that "the Indian empire of Montezuma, which the Spaniards destroyed four hundred years ago, was in many respects as far advanced as some of the European states at that period. This, of course, is based on Prescott, who thinks that "the degree of civilization which they have reached, as inferred from their political institutions, may be considered, perhaps, not much short of that enjoyed by our Saxon ancestors under Alfred." But it is a long call from Alfred to the days of Ferdinand and Isabella.

Dr. Tylor and Mr. Lind vary from Prescott when they make what the latter calls "itinerant traders," or, in our parlance, "peddlers," "a rich and powerful merchant class." Mr. Lind is evidently unacquainted with either Lummis, Bandelier, Enoch or Hale. Susan Hale's book on Mexico, though biased, yet finds a place in "The Stories of Nations," published by T. Fisher Unwyn of London. The author knew something of recent research. She concedes, with Bandelier and Lummis, that before Cortez, Mexico "was inhabited by intelligent races of men." But she also says:

"Empires and palaces, luxury and splendor, fill the accounts of the Spaniards; and imagination loves to adorn the halls of the Montezumas with the glories of an oriental tale. Later explorers, with the fatal penetration of our time, destroy the splendid vision, reducing the emperor to a chieftain, the glittering retinue to a horde of savages, the magnificent civilization, devoted to art, literature and luxury, reduced to a few handfuls of pitiful Indians, quarreling with one another for supremacy; and sighs to think his sympathies may have been wasted on the sufferings of an Aztec sovereign, dethroned by the invading Spaniard."

Susan Hale's only offered consolation is that "after brushing away the sparkling cobwebs of exaggerated reports, enough fact is left to build up a respectable case for the early races of Mexico," and that is all that can be done to-day.



The truth of the matter is that Spanish civilization in Mexico was to early Aztec civilization as light was to darkness; and all that Mexico possesses to-day of civilization she received absolutely from the Spaniards. "Our partisan histories, even our Encyclopedias," says Lummis, "are either strangely silent or strangely biased. They do not seem to recognize the precedence of Spain, nor the fact that she made in America a record of heroism, of unparalleled exploration and colonization, never approached by any other nation anywhere. Long before the Saxon had raised so much as a hut in the new world, or penetrated a hundred miles from the coast, the Spanish pioneers had explored America from Kansas to Cape Horn, and from sea to sea; and had far inland a chain of Spanish cities five thousand miles long."

How does this accord with the "bondage, the ignorance, the vice and the sloth" of the sixteenth century, according to Mr. Lind? As to the cruelty of Spanish conquests, Mr. Lummis says that "they (the Spaniards) were far less cruel than the Saxon ones." The Spaniard never exterminated. He conquered the Aborigine and then converted and educated him."

I have before me a book by Professor Noll of the University of the South, biased, of course, as most such books are. But the professor is forced to concede this: "It may be frankly admitted that the influence of the religious Orders was, in the main, beneficial to the country throughout the sixteenth century. The archbishops and bishops of Mexico exercised great influence in the affairs of government. They were respected by the civil authorities and venerated by the natives. . . . The Jesuits, who arrived in the year 1572, true to the purposes of their Order, tried to foster learning in the new land, though with but limited

success. Other religious Orders established and maintained admirably appointed hospitals and asylums in every large city."

Enoch, an Englishman, whose prejudices are rather fairly distributed against both Mexico and the United States, frankly says: "The Mexican of to-day owes all he has — law, literature, art and social system, and refinements of law and religion — to Spain."

I believe that any honest student of Mexican history can not but come to exactly the same conclusion; but it is not according to Mr. Lind's policy to say anything good of Spain. She must remain now and forever the oppressor of Mexico, the excuse for revolution, and the horrible example, to show the wisdom of the Lind advice.

#### MR. LIND'S PERSONAL VIEWS.

The reading of the section of Mr. Lind's article devoted to his personal opinions is interesting, but not informing. He cites, as a horrible example of the oppression of the peon, that "the minimum fee of the Church for marriages, baptisms and ceremonies of the like character is ten pesos. No peon could accumulate or have so much wealth at one time. If he is ambitious to wed his wife in the Church, or to have his first-born baptized, the fee, with the expense of the *fiesta*, makes him a debtor for life."

This can not apply to all peons, for, later on, Mr. Lind says that the northern peon is "able to get married in the Church, have his child baptized, to live in a decent house, and to educate his children; and he does all these things."

Now, if Mr. Lind had taken the trouble to find out the laws of the Church and the customs of Mexico, he would have had an opportunity to qualify his statements. It has, for example, been specifically laid down for the guidance of pastors that they must not demand a fee of any kind from the poor. According to the Church law, there is not a single person in all of Mexico who can not come to his pastor and, if he is poor, have every one of these ceremonies performed without any offering whatever. I, personally, know one pastor in Mexico who annually has had four hundred marriages without offerings of any kind. In other words, the same law applies in Mexico that applies in the United States; and the same understanding of offerings, in connection with such ceremonies, applies in Mexico as applies in the Protestant churches of the United States. There is not a Protestant minister that I know of, or ever heard of, but expects a fee on the occasion of a marriage, and, I believe, also on the occasion of a funeral, if the people receiving his ministrations are able to give it. How grievously the officiating clergyman would be afflicted if he found his envelope empty! Why? Because his fees are recognized as part of his living. It is the same in Mexico. But 10 pesos in Mexico

does not mean \$10 in this country. At present it means \$2, and at the highest rate of exchange it means \$5. The *fiesta* is the father's own business, and the Church has nothing to do with it.

Would \$5 put the average Mexican peon in debt all his lifetime? Mr. Lind surely does not think the American public is so credulous as to believe that. However, that abuses have occurred is very probable; but when they did, those responsible were acting, not in accord with the law of the Church, but in direct contradiction to it.

Then, too, Mr. Lind does not mention the fees of the state. To save the peon from "bondage" to the priest, the state decreed civil marriage. It is true that the fee is only about 50 cents if the marriage is performed in the office of the magistrate. But no Mexican peasant wants that. He wants the marriage at his house, and the state knows this. Then a carriage must be supplied for the magistrate, and two visits made, at a cost of 8 pesos per visit. So 16 pesos is what the civil officials exact for these marriages, which formerly the peon, by simply stating his poverty, could have had performed for nothing.



The conditions under which the Church is supported in Mexico have also been passed over by Mr. Lind. There is no law that compels the peon to give anything to the support of religion. In some places the people voluntarily make offerings of grain, according to the old Spanish law, which, by the way, is also an old French law, and still in vogue in parts of Canada. But in the greater part of Mexico the priests receive no salary and no offerings of any kind, except the voluntary offerings at marriages, baptisms and funerals. Mr. Lind would suppress all this in Mexico, but would not suppress it among his own people in the United States. As a married man, he presumably has made such offerings himself; but, to do away with all chance of the Church existing at all in Mexico, he censures such a practice in the neighboring republic.

Mr. Lind thinks that the Spaniards came to gather wealth and extend the "authority and fanaticism of Spain"; and they did it so well that they imposed that bondage "spiritually and politically." He concedes always that the English colonial policy was harsh and selfish, but was not as bad as the Spanish. He does not mention a great difference, which is that the Spanish bondage preserved the people and the English bondage annihilated them.

But, in spite of all this, Mr. Lind has found great good in the Mexican people. He found them, for example, courteous and kind, grateful, peaceful, patriotic, not ignorant though illiterate, progressive, skilful, not really lazy, with a charming family life, artistic and hospitable. It would be interesting to ask where they got these good traits. Did they persevere

throughout the entire Spanish régime, or have they sprung up since? Historians tell us very plainly that the Spanish régime gave it to them; and, when you come to think it out, it was not such a bad régime that could leave such marks upon a conquered people. If Spain gave the Mexicans only "spiritual bondage and fanaticism," the "spiritual bondage and fanaticism" produced very wonderful results. Would it not, perhaps, be good for us if we had some spiritual bondage and fanaticism of that kind?



Among the "horrors" that the Spanish régime inflicted upon the Mexicans, Mr. Lind mentions the Inquisition. This is rather strange, for other historians tell us that the Inquisition amounted to very little in Mexico. Some of them even hint that it was a method used by the government of keeping order; and, what Mr. Lind does not seem to know, and which I state under the authority of Professor Noll, "the Indians were, by specific command, exempted from its operations."

Of course, Mr. Lind makes an attempt to explain some of the virtues he found in the Mexicans. For example, that of politeness. He charges it to the tyranny of the upper classes, for class distinction, he says, always compels at least outward politeness. Yet, in another part of his article, he informs us that he can not "recall an instance among the thousands of people that I met and came into contact with, or in my walks about the city or on the country roads, where the slightest rudeness or disrespect was shown." Now, class distinctions make for politeness in the oppressed, but not in the tyrant; but Mr. Lind found the politeness in everybody.

It is much to be wondered at where Mr. Lind secured the following bit of information: "One of the first acts of the Spanish conqueror was to distribute the arable lands of the people among his lieutenants and have churches established." The reason I am wondering where he secured this information is because it is not true. The Spaniards distributed the settled lands among the Indians, retaining for themselves the mines and unsettled lands. The land which the Church afterward acquired was received as donations and bequests from individuals, and not from the State. It is very easy for Mr. Lind to verify this, and, in doing so, will find another fly in his peculiar sort of ointment — where he says "a whole nation was made homeless." Natives at any time could take up land in Mexico, and can do so to this day. If Mr. Lind will take the trouble to consult Enoch's book on Mexico, published by T. Fisher Unwyn of London, he will find, on page 157, the following: "National lands have been set aside in vast areas; and any inhabitant of the republic may 'denounce' or acquire a piece of such land, and retain it by paying an annual tax payment, the prices varying from 2 pesos, in the remote regions, to 20 or 30 pesos per hectare, equal to two and one-half acres, in

the more settled states." In some cases this law may have been found worthless, but it is the law.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lind, in speaking of Morelos, speaks to his own discomfiture. He says that there all the land is owned by twenty-seven men. Well, at one time all of this land was parceled out to the people, who proceeded to sell it to the twenty-seven (if that is the correct number of proprietors), and, having sold it and received the money, now they want it again. The question is, will the people remain proprietors when the land is given to them? I have heard prominent and influential Mexicans say that, if the land is again parceled out, there should be a law passed at the same time forbidding the peon to sell.



Here is another statement that manifests either ignorance or a desire to slander. Speaking of the peon's wages, Mr. Lind says: "They are paid twenty-five centavos per day, and given a small measure (about a pint) of corn. They are permitted to keep a few chickens, and occasionally a goat or two; but if they show the least inclination to increase their possessions, their ambition is promptly curbed." As a matter of fact, the peon is given his house, enough land for himself to raise his garden truck, twenty-five centavos in money, and three litres of corn and a half litre of beans. He is not only permitted to keep a *few* chickens, but as many as he wishes; and also a pig. He also receives wood. Besides this, entirely away from his garden, he has another small piece of land, which is for his use; and he may raise, as he does, corn or anything else on it. It must be remembered, too, that the three litres of corn and a half litre of beans, together with the land he has and the wood, he may use as he pleases; and that all his chickens and pigs live on the hacienda. Of course, conditions are not alike all over Mexico, nor can any one exactly define what a "peon is"; but since Mr. Lind offers his statement to cover a general condition, he might as well be truthful.

"The law of Mexico," Mr. Lind says, "makes it a crime for a person in the employ of another to leave service while in debt to the employer. Consequently, the great land owners take care that all their peons are in debt." What are the facts about this? They are that the peon will not enter service without an advanced payment, which is called the "acomodo," which amounts to from fifteen to twenty dollars. The land owner is not at all anxious to give this, but the peon insists upon it. That binds him to work for a certain length of time, but as a matter of fact, he works as long as he likes and then he moves. Very seldom is the "acomodo" returned to the land owner.



Mr. Lind seems to have very great affection for the Mexican of the North, and he correspondingly despises those of the South. To him the

northern Mexican is the progressive Mexican, and the southern is the one sunk in ignorance and despair. The northern Mexican earns three to four pesos a day in the Texas cotton-fields, on the American railroads and in the mines, so "he has learned to read his own language, and in most cases, has picked up a little English," says Mr. Lind.

This statement is just as untrue as the others. The greatest destitution among the Mexicans is in the North. The loosest morality among Mexicans is in the North. Proof of this Mr. Lind can have by studying the Mexicans in Texas, Arizona and New Mexico, who are all from the North. The most progressive Mexican is in the South. The State of Oaxaca has produced Juarez, Diaz, Pineda, Cervantes, and almost all the governmental brains during the twenty years of Porfirio Diaz. The Oaxaca Indians desire education more than any Indian in the North. The South is the garden spot of Mexico. I wonder if Mr. Lind ever turned his enigmatic face to the South. It is true the Indians in the North have had a better chance — an opportunity to secure better pay, since there is more mining and manufacturing and railroading in the North; there is also better land. But, as a matter of fact, the South is in a much happier condition, and much less prone to revolutionary troubles. No American, who has read reports from Mexico, but knows that the North is the center of revolution, and that the South usually has to be stirred up to join in the blood-letting. A single exception might possibly be the State of Morelos; but it is remarkable, too, as I stated in previous pages, that the revolution in Morelos, under Zapata, showed few of the anti-religious atrocities that accompanied the revolution in the North.

Mr. Lind certainly is optimistic when he states that the northern Indian has learned "to read his own language, and in most cases, has picked up a little English." The truth is that the northern Indian does not want to get an education; and that the southern Indian does. I would ask the reader to remember, in this connection, what I said about Oaxaca. I am not speaking on my own responsibility. I have secured my information from a gentleman who was born in Oaxaca, and who lives in the North, and who was engaged in social work in one of the large cities, but who has had experience in North, South and center. I shall be very glad, indeed, if Mr. Lind is interested, to give my informant's name. He is a Mexican with a European education, and has been a professor in his own country.



Another queer statement of Mr. Lind is that which concerns the operation of the national railroads. He says they were wholly operated by Americans, but that to-day the entire system, from division superintendents to trackmen, is in the hands of peons, who, a generation ago, had not heard steam puff. "They do the engineering, superintend and manage the

shops, construct cars, coaches and locomotives that would do credit to any shop on this side of the line."

It is true, as Mr. Lind says, that "they are not all of the peon class." Neither the engineers, nor the conductors, nor the division superintendents, nor any one else except the laborers, are of the peon class. The fact is that Carranza's experiment was a failure, and that these positions are now open to the Americans, whenever they can get them to come (*vide* the daily papers, which reported about a month ago that the change had been made). The fact is that even when the Mexicans did run the railroads, it was the middle class and not the peon class that did the operating. Mr. Lind fails constantly to distinguish between the two classes.



In the course of his article, the ex-Governor informs us that a Papal bull forbade any instruction in Mexico for two hundred years, except instruction in religion and politeness. Now, Mr. Lind will concede that the Catholic Church is rather a compact organization, and that Papal bulls are usually obeyed by the clergy. Will he kindly explain how it was possible, then, to found the numberless colleges, universities and schools, especially for the Indians, which were established in Mexico by the Spaniards. What Pope issued that bull? What is the date of it? Surely, Mr. Lind knows, and, if he does, he knows more than any authority on Mexico, or any historian of the Church I have ever met.



But the pinnacle of loose statements is reached in the following: "The discipline and restraint shown by the victorious Constitutional army and their chiefs were most creditable and encouraging." I am glad to know what encourages Mr. Lind. He is so quiet-appearing a man, so ministerial-looking, so mild in manner and so silent, that I thought he would be encouraged by the sound of the sickle in the wheat or the hum of industry in the factory, or the scratching of a pen over paper, rather than by the sound of knives cutting throats, guns shooting the innocent, and the thunderous appeals to hatred that came from these victorious armies and their chiefs. Does Mr. Lind think the American people are fools? They know what has happened in Mexico. They know what the "victorious chiefs" have done. They know of the outrages and murders committed. They know that nothing short of the Reign of Terror in France has equaled, for "discipline and restraint," the awful work of his friends in Mexico. This statement from a man who represented the United States, or rather the President of the United States, and must have known everything that went on in Mexico, is one of the most horrible

and blasphemous utterances that I have ever read. It takes the measure at once of John Lind.



Of what use is it to go on further, picking out the things in his article which stamp him as not only incompetent, but absolutely ignorant, after every chance to enlighten himself. If these are the things he told the President of the United States, my contention in previous pages, that the President was deceived, proves to be true. The President must have trusted Mr. Lind. Who would not trust so wise-looking a man? But he trusted him to his own great injury. Mr. Lind was the President's eyes and ears in Mexico, but the eyes saw things that never were, and the ears heard things that are a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end. No wonder we are in trouble over our Mexican policy! No wonder that it stands as the one great failure and blot upon a government that meant well, and that intended to do things for Mexico's good. No wonder that it has raised an angry protest among sixteen million people in this country, and is daily bringing to their aid the enlightened among their fellow citizens. If this is what Mr. Lind learned, he had better go to school again. We did not need to send any one to Mexico to get falsehoods. We had access to the Encyclopedia Britannica for the history of Mexico, and we could have copied our impressions out of it just as Mr. Lind did. And as for the things that he reports of his personal knowledge, we have enough lie factories in the United States without paying John Lind to go to Mexico at the expense of the taxpayers and manufacture more lies.

#### A THIRD PART.

An extra natural division of Mr. Lind's article is his defense of the policy of President Wilson toward Mexico. I am not concerned in attacking President Wilson's policy. I have tried only to give the facts and let people judge for themselves. Moreover, I am in entire sympathy with the President's desire to avoid armed intervention in Mexico. I can go a step farther. I have frequently met and consulted with the archbishops and bishops of Mexico, and I know I speak their minds when I say that *they do not want such intervention*. They are patriotic Mexicans who fear for the independence of their beloved country, who dread the shedding of their countrymen's blood, and who prefer to suffer even death rather than see the foot of an invader step in enmity upon the soil of Mexico. So while as an American I do not want our own country plunged into a war, as the representative of members of the Mexican hierarchy I do not want it for Mexico's sake. What the Mexican bishops want is religious liberty. What American Catholics want is the promise that a government which already has intervened in Mexican affairs to the

extent of telling the Mexican people what they should *not* do, will inform one and all of the factions that the thing they *must do*, if they want recognition by this nation, is to guarantee a true democracy to Mexico, by giving its people what they have not had for fifty years — liberty of conscience.

The President can do that. He ought to do it. He can do no less. We'll forget what is past, but the future, we are determined, shall not be marked by the John Lindisms of the past, by which I mean — the unpardonable blunders of narrow-mindedness and prejudice.

#### WHAT IS WRONG WITH MEXICO?

Without egotism I think I can answer that question. Every one who knows Mexican history and something of the condition of Mexico to-day, can answer it.

Here is the answer: What is our President's endeavor in his Mexican policy? To his honor and credit, let it be said that he is aiming at giving Mexico a lasting solution for her difficulties in the shape of a pure democracy. But no democracy can be built upon the foundation-stone of tyranny. If the President wishes to solve the Mexican problem, he must begin at the foundation; for all semblance of law has vanished from that country. In the United States we believe that a foundation which does not guarantee rights of conscience is a wrong foundation. Our fathers who founded the republic were a unit on that point. They knew that no State can long survive as a tyranny.

I think it is the general belief of the people of the United States that President Wilson intends to recognize no government in Mexico that he does not believe will give a lasting peace to the country. If he does not secure a pure democracy for Mexico now, whatever government he recognizes must be one in which he has confidence that it will at least prepare the people for it. If his policy aims at makeshifts, we are very much mistaken about it.

In order to get at the crux of the difficulty, it is necessary to know that since 1810 Mexico has been at war, civil or foreign, with but an interval of peace. In the final defeat of the Spaniards with Iturbide, in 1821, the last real stable government left Mexico. Since that time, one revolution has followed another. The dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz was the era of peace. But dissatisfaction was always there. Why?

If Mr. Lind will take a glance at the two great political parties of Mexico, and the two great political parties of the United States, he will see where the difficulty lies, always remembering that Mexican democracy is a conceded failure, while that of the United States is a conceded success.

During the progress of the war between Mexico and the United States, the first active attempt at anti-clericalism was made in Mexico. This

attempt took the form of robbing the Church. I do not defend the condition which made the Church something worth robbing. Personally, I think the Church is better off with little property, outside its religious houses, and its houses for charity and education, than it possibly could be with great wealth. But about robbery, there can be only one opinion.

The wrong method was taken with the Church. Catholics resented it; and out of their resentment on one side, and the desire for spoliation on the other, arose the two great political parties of Mexico—the Clerical and the Liberal. The first was defensive and the other offensive. The Clerical party feared spoliation less than the inevitable result confessed by the Liberals as their goal—the restriction of religious liberty. The events of the last year permit us to verify earlier impressions as to what the Liberals really aimed at. Economic and agrarian questions were only side issues. The great issue of Mexican politics was that of liberty of conscience. Little was said about it, for the Church could say little. She did not want to enter politics. But it is easy to understand other tyrannies with this basic injustice in the laws.

*The Mexican people have never been permitted to vote on the question of religious liberty.* It was never clearly put up to the suffrage of the nation. Every revolution was an appeal to arms, and not until Madero came was there even a partial attempt to find out the will of the people. Madero proclaimed a free election. The Clerical party was organized with his encouragement, although he was not a member of it. The result of the election, in spite of the fact that the Liberals did the counting of the votes, was really a verdict for religious liberty. Then revolution broke out again. *Since in a fair battle of ballots, religious liberty would have won, the ballots were replaced by bullets, and the great question still remains open, and still has in it the certainty of future trouble.*



When our own nation was born, its founders settled the question of religious liberty by constitutional enactment. They guaranteed liberty of conscience; and, as a consequence, it was taken out of politics, and every later attempt to make it a part of a political struggle was frowned down upon and defeated by the American people. The parties that fostered such attempts lie wrecked and ruined along the highway of American progress. As a consequence, our political divisions concern themselves about political and industrial questions. They all aim at the material upbuilding of the nation. The foundation-stone of our democracy, in the main, is justice; so we have prospered, and we live at peace with our neighbors.

It is easy, then, to see the radical difference between the Mexican political situation and our own; and it is easy to note the consequence

of each, to put a finger on the canker that is eating the heart out of Mexico, and to know what lies at the root of its political misfortunes. Mexico has a political issue upon which there can be no compromise on the part of the majority of its people. No one can compromise on the question of his natural rights. One may be defeated for the time being, but never conquered. The question of religious liberty is too big for politics. It transcends all other questions—overshadows them, buries them. When men are sincere there can be no other thought on the matter. In Mexico the religious issue is persistent. Fair play can not be secured by arms. The "Liberals" will not yield until the Church is destroyed. They refuse to grant others the rights which they demand for themselves; so all questions which regard the material welfare of the nation are sidetracked. Mexico still suffers as she has suffered for fifty years.

How can the Catholics of Mexico yield? They are not asking for rights which they refuse to grant to their neighbors. Are they wrong in their uncompromising attitude? They have already yielded in every non-essential. They do not ask the return of their old confiscated property. They do not ask a reunion of Church and State. They do not ask for special privileges. They simply ask for the essentials—recognition of their Church's right to exist, to preach, to teach, to administer the Sacraments, and to hold such property as is necessary for the endowment of her charities and her educational establishments. With her it is a fight for life, for liberty to perform her duties. She can not accept laws aimed at these rights, at the sanctity of her priesthood and at her freedom to do acts of charity. Immortal souls are at stake. There is and there can be no further compromise under such conditions.

On the other hand, there is no reason why the Church should be asked to compromise. What she demands is only what our President himself, with his high ideals, would say that a pure democracy gives her a natural right to demand. She has the right to exist. She has the right to minister, and the right to have and to hold what individual free men have consecrated to her service.

For fifty years, upheld by sword and gun, the minority of Mexico has denied the majority its freedom of worship; has interfered with the religious liberty of individuals; has coined their meekness into gold. They have been doing this in the name of "democracy"; so for fifty years there has been no peace in Mexico. Education has been neglected. Agrarian and economic sicknesses have cried out in vain for treatment. Treasuries of successive governments have been looted. Theft has been bold and open; and now comes murder, more robbery, lust and sacrilege. Why? Because fundamentally the whole fabric of Mexican democracy is wrong. It was built on tyranny of the worst kind—tyranny over

men's consciences. The foundation-stone is oppression of the people in the enjoyment of natural rights. You can not tinker with such a structure. You can not improve it so that it will last, unless that false base is pulled out and replaced by justice full and free, by acknowledging the right of the individual to worship God as his conscience tells him to worship Him.

That is the crux of the Mexican difficulty. Here is the thing that needs to be changed. If the United States is to help Mexico to peace and prosperity, the only means the United States has is to point out the fundamental defect; and to insist, now that we have intervened in Mexican affairs, that the cause for future intervention, because of the certainty of future strife in Mexico, must be permanently removed. When the Catholics of the United States ask our Government to refuse recognition to any Mexican government which denies these basic repairs to the Mexican governmental structure, the Catholics of the United States are, at the same time, putting into the President's hands the power to insist upon something which will make his name a future benediction in Mexico; and which will make the American name honored and loved instead of hated and despised, as it is now. Every one in Mexico thinks that we have stirred up religious strife. *The Constitutionalists have killed because they believed the shedding of the blood of priests and nuns would be approved in the United States.* They do not stop to consider that Americans can not approve for Mexico what they hate in their own country.

But is the Church responsible, at least partially, by holding possessions which stirred up the cupidity of men? Even if it were true, that would be no extenuation of robbery. That the victim is rich does not excuse the thief; for the crime does not lie with the robbed, but with the robber. Circumstances may influence the degree of guilt, but not the fact of the crime. Did the Church receive her goods unlawfully? No one claims that she did. The full indictment is that she possessed them. Is that sufficient reason for spoliation? If it is, why do we not enter into a career of spoliation ourselves? Why not rob, as I already pointed out, the endowments of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, Creighton, St. Louis, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, and the other universities of this country which are endowed? Their combined endowments must certainly represent more than all the wealth that was ever held for the combined religious, charitable and educational works of the Church of Mexico. Why not rob Mr. Rockefeller, who individually has more money than a biased writer on Mexico, Professor Noll, charges that the whole Catholic Church possessed? But let that point go. It is fifty years since the Church in Mexico has had property. For the last fifty years she practically has had none. The Laws of Reform robbed her. She can not hold property except in the name of individuals, who may turn around and take it from

her. When the Constitutionalists charged, as an excuse for their crimes, that the Church had given \$20,000,000 to Huerta, they charged that the Church had given far more money than the combined efforts of all her bishops could have raised in ten years. What wealth she had, at any time, came through the self-sacrifice and labor of thousands of her religious men and women, who took for their part poverty, in order that religion might have the means to teach and minister. Recall to mind the stories told of the fabulous wealth of the Church in the Philippine Islands; yet when the friar lands were purchased by the United States, they were found to be worth only \$7,000,000. That \$7,000,000 represented the savings of ten thousand missionaries, who had nothing for themselves but their food and clothes, and who died penniless through a period of three hundred years. Recently France confiscated the "millions" of the Church. When the spoil was counted up, the government had only \$2,000,000.



Yes, it may be urged, but the Church has spent much money to decorate her shrines. She has silver and gold and precious stones. That is very true, but she can not use such wealth. The silver and gold and the precious stones are the free offerings of the people, who look upon them as the possessions of their own particular towns or villages, and jealously guard them. For example, in Oaxaca there is a shrine rich in pearls. Every pearl came from a pearl fisherman; and these very fishermen themselves to-day have hidden them away, in fear of the spoliation *of their own gifts*. What help is it to the Church of Mexico, in a financial way, that the shrines have been enriched by the people? Why charge the Church with having abundant wealth when she has no more power to touch it than the State has—even less? Some time ago an American millionaire said to me: "Why does not the Church in Milan sell the silver, gold and precious stones around the tomb of St. Charles and use the money for missionary and educational purposes?" I recalled to his remembrance the uniformed government officers standing all around the wonderful cathedral—government guards over wealth that is looked upon as the property of the nation, not of the Church. Thoughtless people affect to be scandalized at the riches of the Church, but in reality the Church owns none of these things. A few years ago it was suggested that the Pope present a work of art from the Vatican galleries to an Emperor. In the Italian Chamber of Deputies the Prime Minister, Crispi, arose and stated that the Pope could do no such thing; that the Church was only the guardian of these works of art; that they really belonged to the nation, and that the nation would take them when she desired a new guardian.



For fifty years the Church in Mexico has been poor, living on the offerings of her people, just as the different Protestant churches in America live on the offerings they receive. Now she is told by the Constitutionalists that she can not longer accept even these little offerings. They proclaim that she must no longer teach or preach, dry the tear of sorrow, bind up the wounds of suffering, protect her orphans, or soothe the pillow of the sick. The men who say this ask our nation to uphold them in their tyranny, ask us to put the stamp of our approval on what we know to be a crime against democracy — and John Lind helps them.

We can have permanent peace in Mexico, but we can not have it on the basis outlined by Mr. Lind. We can have it only on the basis that every thoughtful American knows is the one and only and just basis. The religious issue must be taken out of politics; and then politics will be allowed to work for the industrial upbuilding of the country. I don't care who governs Mexico; the Catholics of the United States don't care; but what we do care about is *how*, whoever governs, will act in this matter of keeping fifteen million unarmed people from their religious and natural rights at the behest of a quarter of a million bandits, with guns supplied by English and American commercial interests, having no thought of any man's rights "so long as *they* can fill their dirty pockets."

The persecutors may buy the silence or encouragement of every paper in the United States as they have already bought plenty of them; they may pull the wool over the eyes of a dozen editors of religious weeklies, as they have already done with some; they may land on every wire that connects with a secret lodge, and drag thousands unknowingly into the evil; they may spend millions to "reach" the officials at Washington and keep them fed on lies; they may play on the political "loyalty" of every office-seeker or officeholder in the nation; they may slander through the pens of a thousand Linds and abuse through the mouths of a million Hales and Sillimans; but — they shall not with the silence of sixteen million Catholic Americans fasten anew on a devoted people the shackles of religious persecution.

# Help Circulate the Truth About Mexico

---

THIS BOOK SELLS FOR  
FIFTEEN CENTS

---

Ten Copies for . . . . .	One Dollar
Twenty-five Copies . . . . .	Two Dollars
Fifty Copies . . . . .	Three Dollars and Fifty Cents
One Hundred Copies . . . . .	Six Dollars

---

Postage paid on single copies only.  
Larger quantities by Parcel Post  
or Express at purchaser's expense.

---

ADDRESS

The Catholic Church Extension Society  
McCormick Building, Chicago



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 003 590 801 8